

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52118

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: December 9, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
KAMRYN NICOLE RIORDAN,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Cody L. Brower, District Judge.

Order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Jacob L. Westerfield, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before HUSKEY, Judge; LORELLO, Judge;
and TRIBE, Judge

PER CURIAM

Kamryn Nicole Riordan pled guilty to grand theft by embezzlement, Idaho Code § 18-2403(2)(b).¹ In exchange for her guilty plea, an additional charge was dismissed. The district court sentenced Riordan to a unified term of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years; however, the district court suspended the sentence and placed Riordan on probation for three years. Subsequently, Riordan admitted to violating the terms of probation, and the district court consequently revoked probation and ordered execution of the original sentence but retained

¹ This sentence was ordered to run concurrently to the sentences in Riordan's two other unrelated cases.

jurisdiction. Riordan filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Riordan appeals.

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 or additional information submitted with Riordan's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown. Therefore, the district court's order denying Riordan's Rule 35 motion is affirmed.