

BOISE, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2025, AT 10:00 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

**ST. LUKE’S HEALTH SYSTEM, LTD; ST.)
LUKE’S REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER,)
LTD; CHRIS ROTH, an individual; and)
NATASHA D. ERICKSON, M.D., an)
individual, and TRACY W. JUNGMAN, N.P.,)
an individual,)**

Plaintiffs-Respondents,)

v.)

DIEGO RODRIGUEZ, an individual,)

Docket No. 51244

Defendant-Appellant,)

and)

**AMMON BUNDY, an individual; AMMON)
BUNDY FOR GOVERNOR, a political)
organization; FREEDOM MAN PRESS,)
LLC, a limited liability company; FREEDOM)
MAN PAC, a registered political action)
committee; and PEOPLE’S RIGHTS)
NETWORK, a political organization and an)
unincorporated association,)**

Defendants.)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Nancy Baskin, District Judge.

Diego Rodriguez, Appellant *pro se*.

Holland and Hart, LLP, Boise, for Respondent.

Diego Rodriguez is appealing a default judgment that was entered against him in a defamation lawsuit. The plaintiffs, St. Luke’s Health System Ltd., St. Luke’s Regional Medical Center Ltd., Chris Roth, Natasha Erickson, MD, and Tracy Jungman (collectively “St. Luke’s”), filed the lawsuit against Rodriguez and others, alleging claims of defamation, invasion of privacy,

intentional infliction of emotional distress, common law trespass, statutory trespass, violations of Idaho's Unfair Business Practices Act, violations of Idaho's Charitable Contributions Act, and civil conspiracy. Specifically, St. Luke's claimed that Rodriguez along with other defendants, initiated a smear campaign, accusing St. Luke's of participating in "widespread government conspiracy of kidnapping, trafficking, sexual abuse, and killing of children for financial gain."

On appeal, Rodriguez raises several issues, including claims of judicial and jury bias, as well as violations of his First, Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights. In response, St. Luke's argues that Rodriguez's appeal should be dismissed because Rodriguez failed to set aside the default judgment before appeal. Alternatively, St. Luke's argues Rodriguez's appeal should be dismissed based on the fugitive disentitlement doctrine. If the Court does not dismiss the appeal, St. Luke's contends that the Court may affirm the district court's judgment on the merits.