

SUMMARY STATEMENT
State of Idaho v. Travis Lyle Aldridge
Docket No. 51158

In this case arising out of Custer County, the Court of Appeals affirmed Travis Lyle Aldridge's judgment of conviction for lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen and being a persistent violator. Aldridge was charged with one count of lewd conduct with a minor under sixteen and being a persistent violator after he was accused by his girlfriend's fourteen-year-old daughter of genital-to-genital contact. A jury found Aldridge guilty of both counts.

On appeal, Aldridge argued the district court erred in granting the State's motion to admit evidence of uncharged sex crimes. The Court rejected this argument, holding that Aldridge's I.R.E. 404(b) argument was unpreserved because he did not renew his objection when the evidence was offered at trial. Aldridge also asserted the district court erred in limiting evidence of a prior allegedly false accusation by the victim. The Court disagreed and held that Aldridge's argument failed because it called for a reweighing of the evidence and second guessing the district court's conclusions. Aldridge next argued that the district court erred by allowing a State's witness to testify remotely while denying Aldridge the same opportunity. Aldridge failed to provide a legitimate reason for his witness to testify remotely, so the Court held Aldridge failed to show the district court abused its discretion. Aldridge also challenged the district court's decision to not allow a lay witness to testify about her own "experiment" with altering text messages. The Court rejected this argument, holding that Aldridge failed to show the district court abused its discretion because the appellate record was insufficient to demonstrate error. Aldridge further asserted that the district court erred in permitting an amendment to the timeframe of the offense as alleged in the information. However, because the granting of the amendment did not prejudice Aldridge's substantial rights and because he was granted ample time to prepare a defense, the Court held the district court did not abuse its discretion. Finally, Aldridge also argued that the cumulative effect of the alleged errors warranted a new trial. However, because Aldridge failed to show any error, the Court held the cumulative error doctrine did not apply. As a result, the Court affirmed Aldridge's judgment of conviction. Lorello, J., filed a specially concurring opinion asserting that Aldridge's I.R.E. 404(b) argument was preserved for appeal but reaching the same conclusion.

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