

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52524

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 )  
 ) **Filed: February 9, 2026**  
 )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
 )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Scott Wayman, District Judge.

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

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Abigael E. Schulz, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

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

---

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

---

PER CURIAM

Jullian Paul Sabin pled guilty to lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen, I.C. § 18-1508, and two counts of sexual abuse of a child, I.C. § 18-1506(1). In exchange for his guilty pleas, additional charges were dismissed. The district court sentenced Sabin to a unified term of life imprisonment, with a minimum period of confinement of thirty years, for lewd conduct with a minor and concurrent, determinate terms of twenty-five years for two counts of sexual abuse of a child. Sabin filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Sabin appeals, arguing that the district court erred in denying his 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 Sabin's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown. Therefore, the district court's order denying Sabin's Rule 35 motion is affirmed.