Electronically Filed 2/2/2023 3:38 PM Seventh Judicial District, Fremont County Abbie Mace, Clerk of the Court By: Becky Harrigfeld, Deputy Clerk

R. James Archibald, Esq. Attorney at Law Idaho State Bar No. 4445 1493 North 1070 East Shelley, Idaho 83274 Telephone (208) 317-2908 Email: jimarchibald21@gmail.com

John Thomas, Esq.
Attorney at Law
Idaho State Bar No. 6727
166 Martinsburg Lane
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83404
Telephone: (208) 313-7481

Email: jthomas@co.bonneville.id.us

Attorneys for Defendant

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

STATE OF IDAHO,

Plaintiff,

VS.

LORI VALLOW DAYBELL,

Defendant.

Case No. CR22-21-1624

OBJECTION TO STATE'S MOTION RE MENTAL HEALTH EVIDENCE

Come now the attorneys for the Defendant, and object to the State's Motion re Mental Health Evidence, filed January 26, 2023, as follows:

- The Defendant has determined that at the guilt phase portion of the upcoming trial, no expert witnesses will be called by the defense which will support a claim under Idaho Code 18-207.
- 2. Idaho Code 18-207 provides that mental illness is not a defense to a crime, but mental illness evidence can be presented if it negates an element of a crime. The Defendant has never made any concession or admission that she is guilty of a crime. Therefore, if no crime was committed by her, there is nothing to negate.
- 3. The Court and the State has received all of the written reports regarding Defendant's mental illness which are possessed by the defense. All of the reports would include the reports from Dr. Landers, the four doctors employed by or who contracted with the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare at State Hospital North, and the defense expert, Dr. Cunningham. All of these mental health experts agree that Defendant suffers from a mental illness in varying degrees. Therefore, the State cannot argue to the jury, and the Court could not agree, that she is free from mental illness, because that would contradict the evidence.
- 4. The mental illness reports have been determined by the defense that they go more to mitigation than to guilt or innocence. Defendant believes that she will be acquitted of all charges and that the penalty phase will not be necessary. However, if Defendant is convicted by a jury, it would then be an appropriate time to present the mental illness evidence to the jury in consideration of the potential penalty.
- 5. The defense experts, Drs Cunningham and Watson, have been asked by the undersigned attorneys to provide a summary report for a potential sentencing hearing in this case. All mitigation evidence is relevant and admissible at sentencing. As soon

as those summary reports are received, they will be shared with the government attorneys.

6. Since the defense is not presenting a mental illness defense which would negate an element of the crime at the guilt phase portion of the trial, then likewise, the State will not be provided an opportunity to call their expert witness, Dr. Welner, at the guilt phase portion in the trial.

Dated: February 2, 2023 /s/ Jim Archibald

R. James Archibald, Esq.

Dated: February 2, 2023 /s/ John Thomas

John Thomas, Esq.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on this day I served a true and correct copy of this document on the following by the method of delivery indicated:

Lindsey A. Blake, Esq. efile and serve

Robert H. Wood, Esq. efile and serve

Dated: February 2, 2023 /s/ Jim Archibald

R. James Archibald, Esq.