### BOISE, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2017 AT 8:50 A.M.

#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

In the Matter of: JANE DOE I, A Child Under Eighteen (18) Years of Age.	)
JANE DOE and JOHN DOE II, husband and wife,	) ) ) ) Docket No. 44997
Petitioners-Respondents,	) )
v.	)
JOHN DOE I (2017-15),	)
Respondent-Appellant.	)

Appeal from the Magistrate Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Canyon County. Hon. A. Lynne Krogh, Magistrate Judge.

Canyon County Public Defender, Caldwell, for appellant.

James F. Jacobsen, Boise, for respondent.

\_\_\_\_

In a case arising out of Canyon County, a father ("Father"), appeals the magistrate court's termination of his parental relationship with his daughter ("Child"). Father argues the magistrate court erred when it found that Father had neglected Child because the court ignored evidence the child's mother ("Mother") prevented Father from supporting or contacting Child. Father also argues the magistrate court erred when it determined it was in the best interest of Child to terminate Father's parental rights, because it disregarded Mother's interference in the relationship between Father and Child, and the court impermissibly compared Father's relationship to Child with Step-Father's relationship to Child.

# BOISE, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2017 AT 10:00 A.M.

#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

EMPLOYERS RESOURCE	)
MANAGEMENT COMPANY, an Idaho	)
Corporation,	)
Plaintiff-Appellant,	) <b>Docket No. 44511</b>
v.	)
MEGAN RONK, in her capacity as Director	)
of the Idaho Department of Commerce,	)
Defendant-Respondent.	)
Defendant-Respondent.	)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Samuel Hoagland, District Judge.

Eberle, Berlin, Kading, Turnbow & McKlveen, Chartered, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Employers Resource Management Company ("Employers") challenges the dismissal by the district court in Ada County of its claim for lack of standing. Employers states that it has suffered a concrete and particularized injury due to the actions of the Economic Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce ("EAC") in awarding a tax break to a direct competitor. Employers claims that the implementation of the Idaho Reimbursement Incentive Act and the discretion given to the EAC is unconstitutional. Megan Ronk, in her official capacity as Director of the Idaho Department of Commerce, argues that Employers has not sufficiently pled an injury in fact, and that any harm suffered by Employers was self-inflicted and therefore not actionable.

# BOISE, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2017 AT 11:10 A.M.

### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	
TREVOR GLENN LEE,	) <b>Docket No. 44</b>	932
Defendant-Appellant.	)	
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Third Judicial District, State of Idaho, Payette County. Hon. Susan E. Wiebe, District Judge.

Eric D. Fredericksen, State Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Idaho Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Trevor G. Lee appeals the Payette County district court's denial of his motion to suppress. As part of his plea agreement, Lee reserved the right to challenge the denial of his suppression motion on appeal. The district court concluded the pat-down frisk was reasonable under *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968), but the officer exceeded the scope of the frisk by opening the containers found in Lee's pocket. However, the district court concluded the search of the containers was permissible as a search incident to Lee's arrest because, prior to the search, the officer had probable cause for an arrest for driving without privileges and the search was substantially contemporaneous to the arrest. The court of appeals agreed and affirmed the district court's denial of Lee's motion to suppress. Lee timely appeals.