

BOISE, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2025, AT 10:30 A.M.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 52026

VINCE STUNJA and LISA STUNJA,)
husband and wife,)
)
Plaintiffs-Respondents,)
)
v.)
)
HIGH CORRAL NO. 2 PROPERTY)
OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., an)
Idaho nonprofit corporation,)
)
Defendant-Appellant.)
)
and)
)
HIGH CORRAL HOMEOWNERS)
ASSOCIATION, INC., an Idaho)
nonprofit corporation; and OSPREY)
LAND COMPANY, an Idaho)
corporation,)
)
Defendants.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Boise County. Hon. Theodore J. Fleming, District Judge.

Collins Law, PLLC; Brindee Collins, Boise, for appellant.

Johson May; Wyatt Johnson, Boise, for respondents.

High Corral No. 2 Property Owners Association, Inc. (Association) appeals from the district court's final judgment in which the district court determined that Vince Stunja and Lisa Stunja (Stunjas) were the prevailing parties and, thus, entitled to all of their requested attorney fees and costs. A provision in the First Amended Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for High Corral Subdivision No. 2 (Declaration) provides that, in the event a suit is

brought to enforce the provisions of the Declaration, the prevailing party is entitled to reasonable attorney fees and allowable costs.

Following summary judgment and a jury trial, the Stunjas prevailed on one of the six counts they alleged against the Association. On appeal, the Association argues that recent Idaho Supreme Court precedent dictates that a party can only be granted attorney fees when a contract permits it and the party prevailed on the discrete claim. The Association also argues that the amount of awarded fees is unreasonable and that costs should not be awarded to the Stunjas on the discrete claims in which they were not the prevailing parties.

The Stunjas argue that the district court was correct in awarding the entirety of their requested attorney fees because they were the overall prevailing parties pursuant to the Declaration and Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 54. The Stunjas argue that, because the Declaration's provision permitting attorney fees does not vary from the prevailing party standard in Rule 54, they should be awarded their requested attorney fees and costs expended on all of their claims rather than the one claim they prevailed on. Both the Association and the Stunjas seek attorney fees on appeal.