

BOISE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 17, 2025 at 8:50 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

In the Matter of the Guardianship of:)	
Jane Doe (2022-43), A Minor Child.)	
-----)	
NATASHA RAY,)	
)	
Petitioner-Appellant,)	
)	
and)	
)	
JANE DOE (2022-43))	Docket No. 49946
)	
Minor Child-Appellant,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
KAYLA MARIE MORGAN-SMART)	
and ANTHONY LOWMAN,)	
)	
Respondents.)	
_____)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Ada County, Michael J. Reardon, District Judge and Christopher Bieter, Magistrate Judge.

Seiniger Law Office, Greenville, South Carolina.

Natasha Ray, Eagle, Appellate Pro Se.

Kayla Marie Morgan-Smart, Nampa, and Anthony Lowman, Kuna, Respondents Pro Se.

This is an appeal from the district court’s order dismissing an intermediate appeal of the magistrate court’s judgment of contempt in a guardianship case involving a minor child, Jane Doe. Shortly after Doe was born in 2015, her paternal grandmother, Natasha Ray, was appointed as her temporary guardian with the consent of the father, Anthony Lowman. Over the course of nearly five years, Doe’s parents, Anthony Lowman and Kayla Morgan-Smart (collectively “Parents”) contested the temporary guardianship of Jane Doe. The magistrate court revisited the temporary guardianship order multiple times, extending and modifying it to allow Parents

increased visitation. During the guardianship, attorney Breck Seiniger was asked by Ray to represent Doe, which Seiniger accepted. He was never appointed by the magistrate court.

In 2021, the magistrate court entered several judgments holding Ray in contempt for failing to comply with its visitation orders, among others, and terminating her temporary guardianship effective August 2, 2021. Ray appealed to the district court, and Seiniger filed a petition to intervene and notice of joinder in Ray's appeal on behalf of Doe. Neither Ray nor Seiniger filed an opening brief, however. Instead, several months later, Ray filed a new notice of appeal from a new judgment of contempt entered by the magistrate court in September 2021. Again, neither Ray nor Seiniger filed an opening brief. The district court subsequently dismissed the appeal after determining Ray failed to establish good cause for failing to comply with its scheduling order.

On appeal to this Court, Ray and Seiniger challenge various decisions made by the magistrate court in the contempt and guardianship proceedings. With respect to the guardianship proceedings, they argue, among other things, the magistrate court (1) exceeded its authority under the guardianship statutes, Idaho Code section 15-5-201 et seq., by changing the pre-guardianship status quo and transferring legal custody of Doe back to Parents; (2) refusing to consider uncontested medical/psychological evidence regarding the impact on Doe if the guardianship was terminated; and (3) interfering with Ray's authority as temporary guardian prior to the guardianship's termination. Ray also argues that the magistrate court erred by appointing parenting coordinators. Concerning the contempt orders, Ray argues that her due process rights were violated by the magistrate court because she was unable to competently testify in her defense during trial due to harassment and intimidation by Parents, their counsel, and law enforcement.