



Subsequently in Docket No. 50284, Thurman pled guilty to one count of possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1), and admitted to violating his probation in the other three cases. In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed.

At a joint disposition and sentencing hearing in all four cases, the district court imposed a unified, concurrent sentence of four years with two years determinate in Docket No. 50284 and revoked Thurman's probation and executed his underlying sentences in the other three cases. Thurman filed Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motions in each of the four cases. The district court denied Thurman's request for leniency. Thurman appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence in Docket No. 50284 and by denying his Rule 35 motions in all four cases.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Our role is limited to determining whether reasonable minds could reach the same conclusion as the district court. *State v. Biggs*, 168 Idaho 112, 116, 480 P.3d 150, 154 (Ct. App. 2020). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion in sentencing Thurman in Docket No. 50284.

Next, we review whether the district court erred in denying Thurman's Rule 35 motions. A motion for reduction of sentence under Rule 35 is essentially a plea for leniency, addressed to the sound discretion of the court. *State v. Knighton*, 143 Idaho 318, 319, 144 P.3d 23, 24 (2006); *State v. Allbee*, 115 Idaho 845, 846, 771 P.2d 66, 67 (Ct. App. 1989). In presenting a Rule 35 motion, the defendant must show that the sentence is excessive in light of new or additional information subsequently provided to the district court in support of the motion. *State v. Huffman*, 144 Idaho 201, 203, 159 P.3d 838, 840 (2007). Upon review of the record, including any new information submitted with Thurman's Rule 35 motions, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

Therefore, Thurman's judgment of conviction and sentence in Docket No. 50284, and the district court's orders denying Thurman's Rule 35 motions, are affirmed.