

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52177

STATE OF IDAHO,)
) Filed: July 14, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,)
) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)
) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
JUSTIN SAMUEL SHOPLAND,) OPINION AND SHALL NOT
) BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Defendant-Appellant.)
_____)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Peter G. Barton, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of six years, for sexual exploitation of a child, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Andrea W. Reynolds, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

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

PER CURIAM

Justin Samuel Shopland pled guilty to sexual exploitation of a child. I.C. § 18-1507(2)(b). The district court sentenced Shopland to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of six years, to run concurrently with an unrelated sentence. Shopland appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive.

Mindful that Shopland received the sentence he asked for, he asserts that the district court erred in imposing an excessive sentence. The doctrine of invited error applies to estop a party from asserting an error when his or her own conduct induces the commission of the error. *State v.*

Atkinson, 124 Idaho 816, 819, 864 P.2d 654, 657 (Ct. App. 1993). One may not complain of errors one has consented to or acquiesced in. *State v. Caudill*, 109 Idaho 222, 226, 706 P.2d 456, 460 (1985); *State v. Lee*, 131 Idaho 600, 605, 961 P.2d 1203, 1208 (Ct. App. 1998). In short, invited errors are not reversible. *State v. Gittins*, 129 Idaho 54, 58, 921 P.2d 754, 758 (Ct. App. 1996). This doctrine applies to sentencing decisions as well as rulings made during trial. *State v. Griffith*, 110 Idaho 613, 614, 716 P.2d 1385, 1386 (Ct. App. 1986).

Therefore, because Shopland received the sentence he requested, he may not complain that the district court abused its discretion. Accordingly, Shopland's judgment of conviction and sentence is affirmed.