

**BOISE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2026, AT 10:30 A.M.**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

**Docket No. 52341**

<b>STATE OF IDAHO,</b>	)
	)
<b>Plaintiff-Respondent,</b>	)
	)
<b>v.</b>	)
	)
<b>ALLEGHENY CASUALTY COMPANY</b>	)
<b>and A-AFFORDABLE BAIL BONDS</b>	)
<b>IDAHO, LLC,</b>	)
	)
<b>Real Party in Interest-Appellants.</b>	)
	)
<b>and</b>	)
	)
<b>DAOBANG HUANG,</b>	)
	)
<b>Defendant-Respondent.</b>	)

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Patrick J. Miller, District Judge.

Magyar Rauch & Associates PLLC; Gregory R. Rauch, Moscow, for appellants.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kale D. Gans, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent, State of Idaho.

---

Allegheny Casualty Company and A-Affordable Bail Bonds Idaho, LLC (Allegheny) appeal from the district court's order denying their motion to set aside forfeiture and exonerate the bail they posted on behalf of Daobang Huang. Huang, an Illinois resident and a Chinese citizen, had multiple charges pending in Idaho and Texas. The district court ordered bail forfeited after Huang failed to appear at a scheduled hearing on October 30, 2023. At the hearing, the State advised the district court that Huang had left the United States using his valid Chinese passport.

On appeal, Allegheny initially asks this Court to clarify the standard of review that applies when a district court, in deciding whether to exonerate a bond, determines whether it abused its discretion in issuing a bench warrant. As to the substantive arguments, Allegheny contends that

the district court abused its discretion by: (1) not issuing a bench warrant and notice of forfeiture the first time Huang failed to appear at a hearing in August 2023; (2) concluding that the district court's own actions in continuing hearings and allowing Huang to appear remotely did not materially increase the risk of forfeiture; (3) applying the Idaho Criminal Rule 46(h)(1) factors to the motion to set aside forfeiture and exonerate bond; and (4) failing to consider whether a partial forfeiture was appropriate.