Electronically Filed 12/1/2022 5:13 PM Seventh Judicial District, Fremont County Abbie Mace, Clerk of the Court By: Shannon Cook, 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

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,

v.

LORI NORENE VALLOW AKA LORI NORENE DAYBELL,

Defendant.

Case No.: CR22-21-1624

STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL

The State of Idaho hereby responds to the Defendant's Motion to Compel as follows:

The State has no objection to turning over statements by witnesses as required by ICR 16. The

State has complied with this requirement and will continue to do so.

The State objects to the Defendant's Motion to Compel in so far as it appears to request that the Court order the State to disclose every interaction the State has with witnesses. Nothing in Rule 16 requires the State to disclose trial or hearing preparation with witnesses. This is simply an attempt by the Defendant to obtain the State's work product and trial strategy. Further, Rule 16 does not require the State to disclose when a victim (who may also be witness) exercises their statutory and constitutional right to contact the State with questions regarding hearings, case updates, etc. In the event a witness has provided new or different information than what has been previously provided, the State has disclosed that information and will continue to do so.

The State, through investigators, has conducted some ongoing investigation/interviews, and when this has occurred a report has been provided to the Defense. Any video/audio of

RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL

1

interviews will continue to be provided to the Defense. There are a few reports being finalized of

recent follow up interviews with some witnesses, and once they are completed and in the State's

possession, they will be provided to Defense.

The State is confused by the Defendant's false assertion that the State takes "the position

that they (the State) do not need to turn this information over to the defense because the FBI, not

state investigators, conducted the interviews" The State has never expressed or held this

position. Indeed, the State has turned over voluminous material from the FBI – including multiple

reports of interviews conducted by the FBI in relation to this case, and material obtained by the

FBI.

The State objects to the Defense's false assertion that the State has taken a posture that it

has no duty to disclose. Such a statement is disingenuous at best in view of the massive amount

of discovery provided by the State. The State has complied with the requirements under Idaho

Criminal Rule 16 and continues to do so.

Wherefore, the State respectfully request the Court deny the Defendant's Motion to

Compel since the State has, and continues, to provide discovery pursuant to Idaho Criminal Rule

16, and any request by the Defendant to go beyond that, is clearly a request to obtain the State's

work product and/or trial strategy.

DATED this 1st day of December, 2022

/s/ Lindsey A. Blake

Lindsey A. Blake

Prosecuting Attorney for Fremont County

/s/ Rob H. Wood

Rob H. Wood

Prosecuting Attorney for Madison County

RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL

2

CERTIFICATE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 1st day of December, 2022, that a copy of the foregoing RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL was served as follows:

R. James Archibald		U.S. Mail
Jimarchibald21@gmail.com		Hand Delivered
		Courthouse Box
		Facsimile:
	X	File & Serve
		Email
John Kenneth Thomas		U.S. Mail
<u>ithomasserve@co.bonneville.id.us</u>		Hand Delivered
		Courthouse Box
		Facsimile:
	X	File & Serve
		Email
John Prior		U.S. Mail
john@jpriorlaw.com		Hand Delivered
		Courthouse Box
		Facsimile:
	X	File & Serve
		Email
	By: /s/ Joo	li L. Thurber