

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 51161

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 NICHOLAS MICHAEL STRANGE,)
)
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. John T. Mitchell, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Sally J. Cooley, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; HUSKEY, Judge;
and LORELLO, Judge

PER CURIAM

Nicholas Michael Strange entered an *Alford*¹ plea to possession of a controlled substance. I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1). In exchange for his guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed and the State agreed not to file an allegation that he is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Strange to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of four years. Strange filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Strange appeals, arguing that

¹ See *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970).

his sentence is excessive and that the district court erred in denying his Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence.

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.

Next, we review whether the district court erred in denying Strange's Rule 35 motion. 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 Strange's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

Therefore, Strange's judgment of conviction and sentence, and the district court's order denying Strange's Rule 35 motion, are affirmed.