

## SUMMARY STATEMENT

*Mitchell v. Ramlow*

Docket No. 50287-2022

This case addresses whether an appeal from an expired civil protection order falls within an exception to the mootness doctrine. The district court determined that Nicholas Ramlow's intermediate appeal from a civil protection order was moot when the order expired during the pendency of the appeal. Mr. Ramlow timely appealed the district court's dismissal of his appeal to the Idaho Supreme Court. Mr. Ramlow contended on appeal that the district court erred when it dismissed his appeal because his appeal fell within all three exceptions to the mootness doctrine. Amanda Mitchell countered that Mr. Ramlow's appeal was moot and that his appeal did not satisfy an exception to the mootness doctrine.

The Idaho Supreme Court determined that Mr. Ramlow had failed to show that his appeal fell within any exception to the mootness doctrine. The Idaho Supreme Court held that: (1) the *capable of repetition yet evading review* exception did not apply because Mr. Ramlow's appeal was too fact-specific; (2) the *collateral consequences* exception did not apply because Mr. Ramlow failed to establish that he faced any collateral legal consequences because of the expired protection order; and (3) the *substantial public interest* exception did not apply because Mr. Ramlow's appeal from an expired civil protection order did not raise any issues of substantial public interest. The Idaho Supreme Court affirmed the district court's order dismissing Mr. Ramlow's intermediate appeal as moot.

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