

BLACKFOOT, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2025 AT 11:10 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

RYAN MONSON, an individual,)	
)	Docket No. 51838
Plaintiff-Appellant-)	
Cross Respondent,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
NANCY J. MONSON, individually, and)	
TAUTPHAUS PARK STORAGE, LLC, an)	
Idaho limited liability company; and NANCY)	
J. MONSON, Personal Representative of the)	
ESTATE OF HAL LAMAR MONSON,)	
)	
Defendants-Respondents-)	
Cross Appellants.)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bonneville County. Bruce L. Pickett District Judge.

Parsons Behle & Latimer, Idaho Falls, for Appellant, Ryan Monson.

Beard St. Clair Gaffney PA, Idaho Falls, for Respondents, Nancy J. Monson, individually, and Tautphaus Park Storage LLC.

Merrill & Merrill, Chtd., Pocatello, for Attorneys for Respondent Nancy J. Monson, as personal representative of the Estate of Hal Lamar Monson.

This appeal arises from a dispute between siblings, Ryan and Nancy Monson, over the ownership of Tautphaus Park Storage, LLC (TPS), a business once operated by their late father, Hal Monson. Initially, Ryan attempted to raise claims in his father's probate case. He alleged that Hal, not Nancy, remained the owner of TPS at his death because Hal suffered from dementia and lacked the capacity to transfer his ownership interests to Nancy. Ryan asserted that Nancy used her positions—as her father's attorney, manager of TPS, and executor of Hal's estate—to secure the company for herself. Ryan eventually filed a separate civil case in district court, containing similar allegations, against TPS, as well as Nancy in her personal capacity and in her capacity as personal representative of Hal's estate.

The dispute between Ryan and Nancy proceeded through both probate and district court proceedings. Following years of litigation and multiple transfers between courts, the district court dismissed TPS and Nancy individually as defendants, leaving only claims against Nancy in her capacity as personal representative. Ultimately, on Nancy's motion to dismiss, the district court concluded that Ryan's claims were filed in the wrong forum and were barred in the probate matter

by the statute of limitations. Although the district court determined Nancy and TPS were the prevailing party, the court denied Nancy and TPS's motions for attorney fees.

On appeal, Ryan argues that the district court erred in dismissing his claims on procedural grounds. He maintains that the Trust and Estate Dispute Resolution Act allows claims to be filed in a separate action. In addition, he emphasizes that the undisputed facts demonstrate that his father lacked the capacity to transfer his ownership in TPS.

Nancy, in her capacity as personal representative, counters that Ryan filed his claims improperly outside probate, and the claims are now time-barred because the estate has been closed. She maintains she acted appropriately as executor and disclosed all relevant information. TPS and Nancy, in her individual capacity, contend that TPS was never an estate asset, that Ryan had no legal ownership interest in the company, and that TPS should never have been named in the case.

On cross-appeal, Nancy, in both capacities, and TPS ask the Supreme Court to reverse the district court's denial of their motions for attorney fees. TPS and Nancy, in her individual capacity, argue that the district court erred in denying them attorney fees because the court did not reach its decision through an exercise of reason. They note that the court did not distinguish between the defendants' claims for attorney fees despite TPS and Nancy's early dismissal from the district court case. Nancy, as personal representative, contends that the district court should have awarded attorney fees because Ryan's claims were frivolous.