

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 53222

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	Filed: April 14, 2026
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk
v.)	
)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
JERROD LEE DEVANEY,)	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. Cynthia Yee-Wallace, District Judge.

Order denying Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, 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

Jerrod Lee Devaney entered an *Alford*¹ plea to burglary, Idaho Code § 18-1401 and pleaded guilty to felony possession of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, I.C. § 37-2732(c). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charged were dismissed. The district court imposed a unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of incarceration of four years, for burglary and an indeterminate sentence of seven years for possession of methamphetamine to be served consecutively to the burglary sentence. Devaney filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Devaney appeals.

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

A motion for reduction of sentence under I.C.R. 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 an I.C.R. 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 Devaney's I.C.R. 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown. Therefore, the district court's order denying Devaney's I.C.R. 35 motion is affirmed.