

**SUMMARY STATEMENT**  
*State of Idaho v. Jessica Anne Vazquez*  
Docket No. 50500

In this case arising out of Blaine County, the Court of Appeals affirmed Jessica Anne Vazquez's judgment of conviction and unified sentence of eight years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for trafficking in methamphetamine and a consecutive, indeterminate sentence of one year for delivery of a controlled substance. Vazquez sold methamphetamine and heroin to a confidential informant during a controlled buy. At trial, the State offered numerous text messages between Vazquez and the confidential informant that occurred over a six-month period following the controlled buy in which they discussed additional transactions. The text messages were admitted over Vazquez's objection. Ultimately, the jury found Vazquez guilty.

On appeal, Vazquez argued the text messages that were exchanged following the controlled buy were not relevant to the issue of whether she was predisposed to committing the crimes at the time they were committed. In other words, because entrapment occurs when an otherwise innocent person (not inclined to commit a criminal offense) is induced to do so by a State agent, Vazquez argued it follows that evidence of the defendant's state of mind *after* the crime is committed is not relevant. The Court rejected Vazquez's argument and held that, when a defendant asserts entrapment as a defense, the defendant's predisposition to commit the crime absent state action is placed at issue. As a result, the Court concluded the district court did not err in finding that the text messages, which were exchanged after Vazquez sold the drugs, were relevant to prove intent. Vazquez further asserted that the probative value of the text messages was substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice. The Court was unpersuaded and concluded the district court did not err in determining that the probative value of the evidence was not substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice. Vazquez also argued the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences. However, after reviewing the record and applying the relevant standards, the Court disagreed and held that the district court did not abuse its sentencing discretion. As a result, the Court affirmed Vazquez's judgment of conviction and sentences.

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