

## SUMMARY STATEMENT

*State v. Farrell-Quigle*, Docket No. 46107

This appeal addresses alternative methods for child witness testimony. Robert Farrell-Quigle appealed a judgment of conviction for two counts of lewd conduct after the district court allowed a physical shielding screen to be used to separate him from testifying child witnesses. Farrell-Quigle argued that the use of the screen deprived him of his Fourteenth Amendment due process right to a fair trial, violated his Sixth Amendment right to confront the witnesses against him, and failed to comply with Idaho's laws on alternative methods for child witness testimony.

The Idaho Supreme Court held that the use of a shielding screen as an alternative method of testimony for child witnesses violated Farrell-Quigle's right to a fair trial under the Fourteenth Amendment. Accordingly, the Idaho Supreme Court vacated Farrell-Quigle's judgment of conviction and remanded the case for a new trial. The Idaho Supreme Court also adopted a new rule that, upon a showing of a compelling state interest as set forth in Idaho Code section 9-1805, the only allowed alternative method of testimony for child witnesses will be one in which the witness testifies from a separate location and appears live, on a screen in the courtroom.

\*\*\*This summary constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court, but has been prepared by court staff for the convenience of the public.\*\*\*