IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 53487

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	**Filed: October 20, 2026**
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	**Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.	)	
	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
JAYLEN KAI MAYFIELD,	)	**OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
	)	**BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
Defendant-Appellant.	)	
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Elmore County. Hon. Theodore Fleming, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for aggravated battery, affirmed; order denying Idaho Criminal Rule 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; PETTY, Judge
and HUSKEY, Judge Pro Tem

PER CURIAM

Jaylen Kai Mayfield pled guilty to aggravated battery. Idaho Code § 18-907(1)(A). The district court sentenced Mayfield to a unified sentence of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years. Mayfield filed an I.C.R. 35 motion, which the district court denied. Mayfield appeals, arguing that his sentence is excessive and that the district court erred in denying his I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence.

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). Our role is limited to determining whether reasonable minds could reach the same conclusion as the district court. *State v. Biggs*, 168 Idaho 112, 116, 480 P.3d 150, 154 (Ct. App. 2020). 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 Mayfield's I.C.R. 35 motion. 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 Mayfield's I.C.R. 35 motion, we conclude no abuse of discretion has been shown.

Therefore, Mayfield's judgment of conviction and sentence, and the district court's order denying Mayfield's I.C.R. 35 motion, are affirmed.