

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 48198

STATE OF IDAHO, )  
 ) **Filed: June 21, 2021**  
 ) **Plaintiff-Respondent,** )  
 ) **Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**  
v. )  
 ) **THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**  
 ) **OPINION AND SHALL NOT**  
 ) **BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**  
 ) **CHARLES ROBERT CORTEZ,** )  
 ) **Defendant-Appellant.** )  
 )

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Nancy A. Baskin, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent, unified sentences of ten years with two years determinate for domestic violence and five years indeterminate for eluding a peace officer, affirmed; order denying I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth Ann Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Kenneth K. Jorgensen, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

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

---

PER CURIAM

Charles Robert Cortez pled guilty to domestic violence, Idaho Code §§ 18-918(2), 18-903(a), and eluding a peace officer, I.C. § 49-1404(2)(b) and/or (c). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. The district court imposed concurrent, unified sentences of ten years with two years determinate for domestic violence and five years indeterminate for eluding a peace officer. Cortez filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Cortez appeals.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Next, we review whether the district court erred in denying Cortez's 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 Cortez's Rule 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

Therefore, Cortez's judgment of conviction and sentences, and the district court's order denying Cortez's Rule 35 motion, are affirmed.