Electronically Filed 1/12/2023 4:04 PM Seventh Judicial District, Fremont County Abbie Mace, Clerk of the Court By: Becky Harrigfeld, Deputy Clerk

Lindsey A. Blake, ISB #7920 Rob H. Wood, ISB #8229 OFFICE OF THE FREMONT COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY 22 W. 1st N. St. Anthony, ID 83445

Tel: 208-624-4418

Email: prosecutor@co.fremont.id.us

Attorneys for the State

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE SEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF FREMONT

STATE OF IDAHO,

Plaintiff,

RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR A
JOINT SETTLEMENT AND STRATEGY SESSION

LORI NORENE VALLOW AKA
LORI NORENE DAYBELL,

Defendant.

The State of Idaho, by and through the Fremont County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, submits the following Response to the Defendant's Motion for a Joint Settlement and Strategy Session.

The State has serious reservations about allowing the Codefendants to have face-to-face, or other communication directly with each other. While the State recognizes that the Defendants may communicate through their counsel, and also may strategize together through their attorneys, which the State would not be a Party to or have input on; there is no inherent right or privilege for the Defendants to have direct communication. The State recognizes that the Defendants have agreed to not use any evidence or information they may obtain through any discussions or meetings against each other; nevertheless, the State is not willing to make a similar agreement. Any communications between each individual Defendant and his/her

attorney(s) are confidential; however, having the other Defendant and/or his/her counsel present

would make them potential witnesses of statements made by the other Defendant and eliminate

any claim to attorney/client privilege.

In addition, the Defendant is arguing there is a privilege pursuant to Idaho Rules of

Evidence 408, 410 and 507. This is simply not the case. I.R.E. 408 deals with statements made

during settlement or mediation negotiations, but without the State present, there can be no true

settlement or mediation. Regarding I.R.E. 410 since there is no plea being entered, and no

attorney for the prosecution proposed to be present for the discussion, this rule is not applicable.

I.R.E. 507 is applicable to mediations, but the rule doesn't necessarily protect statements made

by Codefendants especially to each other. In addition, the Defendant is requesting to have a

Settlement Conference separate from any mediation.

Once further concern for the State is how a meeting would be facilitated which would

protect the confidential privilege the Defendant is claiming and also meet the safety concerns and

guidelines – especially given the nature of the charges pending against them.¹

Wherefore the State respectfully requests the Court consider the concerns raised

by the State.

DATED this 12th day of January, 2023.

/s/Rob H. Wood

Rob H. Wood

Prosecuting Attorney

/s/Lindsey A. Blake

Lindsey A. Blake

Prosecuting Attorney

¹ The State has additional concerns for Defendant Vallow/Daybell based on the competency proceedings.

RESPONSE TO THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR A JOINT SETTLEMENT AND STRATEGY SESSION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 12th day of January, 2023, that a copy of the foregoing document was served as follows:

Jim Archibald 1493 North 1070 East Shelley, Idaho 83274 jimarchibald@gmail.com		U.S. First Class Mail Hand Delivered Courthouse Box Facsimile: File & serve
John Thomas Bonneville County Public Defenders 605 North Capital Ave. Idaho Falls, Idaho 83402 jthomasserve@co.bonneville.id.us		U.S. First Class Mail Hand Delivered Courthouse Box Facsimile: File & serve
John Prior Law Office of John Prior 429 SW 5th Street, Ste. 110 Meridian, Idaho 83462 john@jpriorlaw.com		U.S. First Class Mail Hand Delivered Courthouse Box Facsimile: File & serve
	By: /s/ Jodi L. Thurber	