IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 43305

STATE OF IDAHO,) 2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 397
Plaintiff-Respondent,) Filed: February 22, 2016
v.) Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
ROBIN J. BELDEN,) THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
Defendant-Appellant.	OPINION AND SHALL NOT BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
Bonner County. Hon. Barbara A. Bucha Order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for redu Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Publi Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for ap	ic Defender; Jenny C. Swinford, Deputy

PER CURIAM

Pursuant to a plea agreement, Robin J. Belden pled guilty to felony driving under the influence. I.C. § 18-8004(1)(a). At sentencing, Belden requested probation, with an underlying unified sentence of three years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year. The district court followed Belden's recommendation and sentenced Belden to a unified term of three years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year. The district court suspended the sentence and placed Belden on probation. Belden filed an I.C.R 35 motion, which the district court denied. Belden appeals.

Before MELANSON, Chief Judge; GUTIERREZ, Judge; and HUSKEY, Judge

Mindful that Belden received the sentence he asked for and that he did not include any new or additional information with his Rule 35 motion, Belden asserts that the district court erred in denying his Rule 35 motion. 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 Belden received the sentence he requested, Belden may not complain that the district court abused its discretion. Therefore, the district court's order denying Belden's Rule 35 motion is affirmed.