

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52234

STATE OF IDAHO,	)
	) Filed: October 10, 2025
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)
	) Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.	)
	) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
AMANDA NICOLE PINON,	) 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. Jonathan Medema, District Judge.

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

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Stacey M. Donohue, 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

Amanda Nicole Pinon entered an *Alford*¹ plea to forgery. I.C. § 18-3601. In exchange for her guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed including an allegation that she is a persistent violator. The district court sentenced Pinon to a determinate term of four years. Pinon filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Mindful that she did not provide new information, Pinon appeals and argues that the district court erred in denying her Rule 35 motion.

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

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, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown. Therefore, the district court's order denying Pinon's Rule 35 motion is affirmed.