

BOISE, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 2024 at 8:50 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	
v.)	Docket No. 49742
)	
DUSTIN ROBERT MANSFIELD,)	
)	
Defendant-Appellant.)	
<hr/>)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Bannock County, Rick Carnaroli, District Judge.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for Appellant.

Raúl R. Labrador, Idaho Attorney General, Boise, for Respondent.

Dustin Mansfield appeals from his judgment of conviction for introduction of contraband into a correctional facility. In March 2022, fourteen months after the State filed an information against him, Mansfield filed a motion to dismiss based on an alleged violation of his statutory and constitutional rights to a speedy trial. The district court denied the motion. Applying the tolling provision from the Idaho Supreme Court’s emergency orders in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the district court concluded that the six-month time period to hold a trial under Idaho Code section 19-3501(2) had not yet elapsed because in-person trials were prohibited due to COVID-19 infection rates statewide or in Bannock County during a significant portion of Mansfield’s case. The district court also determined that the COVID-19 pandemic and the emergency orders prohibiting jury trials in response to the pandemic constituted good cause for any delay and concluded that Mansfield’s right to a speedy trial under the state and United States constitutions had not been violated. Mansfield then entered a conditional guilty plea to one count of introduction of contraband into a correctional facility, preserving his right to appeal the district court’s denial of his motion to dismiss.

On appeal, Mansfield contends that the district court erred in denying his motion to dismiss. Mansfield argues the district court erred in its speedy trial calculation under Idaho Code section 19-3501(2), which requires a criminal defendant to be brought to trial within six-months of the date the information is filed against him, unless good cause for a delay is shown. He also argues the COVID-19 pandemic and emergency orders prohibiting in-person trials in response to that pandemic did not constitute good cause or a valid reason for the delay in his case and the Idaho Supreme Court lacked authority to issue emergency orders suspending the right to a speedy trial at various time points during the COVID-19 pandemic.