

**BOISE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 2026, AT 8:45 A.M.**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

**In the Interest of:**  
**JANE DOE (2024-29),**  
**Juvenile Under Eighteen (18) Years.**

**STATE OF IDAHO,**

**Plaintiff-Respondent,**

**V.**

**JANE DOE (2024-29),**

**Juvenile-Appellant.**

**Docket No. 51814**

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Ada County. Gerald F. Schroeder, District Judge. Theresa L. Gardunia, Magistrate Judge.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for Appellant.

Raúl R. Labrador, Idaho Attorney General, Boise, for Respondent.

Jane Doe appeals from her sentence for vehicular manslaughter. When Doe was 16 years old, she made an illegal U-turn that caused a collision with an oncoming motorcycle. The driver of the motorcycle died from injuries he sustained during the accident. Following an evidentiary hearing, the magistrate court found that Doe fell within the purview of the Juvenile Corrections Act and that Doe committed vehicular manslaughter under Idaho Code section 18-4006(3)(c).

The magistrate court sentenced Doe to 90 days in detention, with 48 days suspended. For the remaining 42 days, the magistrate court ordered 250 hours of community service, which would comprise 32 days of Doe's detention time. The magistrate court ordered that the remaining 10 days be served in detention. Additionally, the magistrate court placed Doe on probation for three years, suspended her driver's license for three years, and imposed public defender reimbursement in the amount of \$1,500.

Doe appealed the sentence to the district court, arguing that the sentence was excessive, an abuse of discretion, cruel and unusual, and unlawfully interfered with her parents' rights. She claimed the magistrate court impermissibly considered retribution and punishment when imposing her sentence. However, the district court determined that the magistrate court acted within its discretion and affirmed the sentence.

Doe appeals the district court's decision. She argues that the district court erred because it reviewed Doe's sentence under adult sentencing standards, and the Juvenile Corrections Act set

forth the only factors that govern juvenile sentencing. She argues that the magistrate court abused its discretion when it applied adult sentencing standards and that the district court erred in affirming the sentence.