

**BOISE, WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 2025 AT 10:00 A.M.**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

<b>HARRY JOHNSON, individually, and as</b>	)	
<b>Representative of the Estate of Colby Eldon</b>	)	<b>Docket No. 50970</b>
<b>Johnson, Deceased,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff-Appellant,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>BEADZ BROTHERS FARMS, an Idaho</b>	)	
<b>partnership,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendant-Respondent,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>and</b>	)	
	)	
<b>SNAKE RIVER MANUFACTURING, LLC,</b>	)	
<b>an Idaho entity; SRM DOUBLE L, LLC, an</b>	)	
<b>Idaho entity; DOUBLE L</b>	)	
<b>MANUFACTURING, INCORPORATED, an</b>	)	
<b>Idaho entity,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Gooding County. Rosemary Emory, District Judge.

Patrick Daniel Law, *Pro Hac Vice*, Houston, Texas, and Jacobson & Jacobson, PLLC, Boise, for Appellant.

Kirton McConkie, Boise, for Respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_

This appeal arose from the death of Henry Johnson's son, Colby, while he was operating a truck and self-emptying potato trailer at Beadz Brothers Farms in 2020. Following Colby's death, Mr. Johnson filed a lawsuit against Beadz Brothers, among others, and alleged that Beadz Brothers' negligence resulted in Colby's death. Beadz Brothers moved for summary judgment on Mr. Johnson's claims and argued that Mr. Johnson's remedies were limited to the worker's compensation process based on the exclusive remedy rule. Although he did not file a formal motion to continue the hearing, Mr. Johnson argued that he needed more time to gather evidence to oppose the Beadz Brothers' motion. He also filed a brief in opposition to the motion, where he argued there were factual issues related to Colby's employment status at the time of his death, and the

circumstances surrounding Colby's accident, that required a jury trial. Alternatively, Mr. Johnson maintained that the exclusive remedy rule did not apply to his case because his case satisfied the "unprovoked physical aggression" exception to the rule.

The district court noted that Mr. Johnson failed to formally request a continuance of the hearing, and that he did not show specific reasons why he needed more time to gather evidence in order to oppose the motion. As a result, the district court did not delay reaching a decision on the Beadz Brother's motion. Both parties moved to exclude evidence presented in support of and in opposition to the motion. The district court excluded most of Mr. Johnson's exhibits because it determined they were irrelevant, lacked foundation, or were otherwise inadmissible. It did consider the Beadz Brothers' exhibits for the limited purpose of establishing that Colby was a Beadz Brothers' employee at the time of his death. The district court determined that there were no factual issues that required a jury trial, and that the exclusive remedy rule barred Mr. Johnson's negligence claims. Ultimately, the district court granted summary judgment in favor of Beadz Brothers and Mr. Johnson's claims against Beadz Brothers were dismissed.

Mr. Johnson timely appealed. On appeal, Mr. Johnson argues that the district court erred when it denied his request to delay the decision on the motion in order to gather additional evidence. He argues that the district court erred when it excluded his exhibits and when it considered the Beadz Brothers' exhibits. Mr. Johnson maintains that the district court erred when it granted summary judgment because there were factual issues that required a jury trial. He also contends that the exclusive remedy rule in worker's compensation does not apply to his case, or alternatively, that his negligence claims satisfy the "unprovoked physical aggression" exception to the rule. Beadz Brothers argue on appeal that the district court did not err, and they ask this Court to affirm the district court's decision.