IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 43801

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	**2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 574**
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	**Filed: June 17, 2016**
	)	
v.	)	**Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk**
	)	
RYAN EVERETT LANGFORD,	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
	)	**OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
Defendant-Appellant.	)	**BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Richard S. Christensen, District Judge.

Order denying Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, <u>affirmed</u>.

Sara B. Thomas, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

_____

Before GUTIERREZ, Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and HUSKEY, Judge

_____

PER CURIAM

Ryan Everett Langford pleaded guilty to two counts of rape, Idaho Code § 18-6101(a), and entered an *Alford*[1] plea to one count of sexual abuse of a child under sixteen years of age, I.C. § 18-1506. The district court imposed two unified twelve-year sentences, with four years determinate, for the rape charges, and a unified seven-year sentence, with four years determinate, for the sexual abuse of a child under sixteen years of age charge. All sentences were ordered to run concurrently. Langford filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Langford 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 Langford's I.C.R. 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown. Therefore, the district court's order denying Langford's I.C.R. 35 motion is affirmed.