

BOISE, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2024, AT 8:50 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	Docket No. 49909
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
CHADLEN DEWAYNE SMITH,)	
)	
Defendant-Appellant.)	

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Barbara Duggan, District Judge.

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

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

Chadlen Dewayne Smith appeals his judgment of conviction for the sexual exploitation of a child by possession of sexually exploitative material. The Post Falls Police Department’s initial investigation of Smith originated from allegations of stalking. The investigation started after a dispatcher reported noticing Smith following her home after her shift at the police department. Smith was later seen driving around and taking pictures in the area of the dispatcher’s home on several occasions before being arrested for stalking in the second degree. After his arrest, the police seized Smith’s phone to search for evidence of the stalking, pursuant to a search warrant. During the search, an explicit photograph of a child was found on the phone.

Detectives subsequently arrested Smith again, this time for the sexual exploitation of a child. After the arrest, law enforcement seized and inventoried Smith’s car. A Kootenai County district judge granted detectives a search warrant for Smith’s laptop, which they discovered in his vehicle during the inventory search. As a result of the search, more evidence of the sexual exploitation of a child was discovered on Smith’s laptop.

On appeal, Smith raises three issues. First, Smith argues that the district court erred in denying his motion to suppress the evidence found on his laptop. He claims that the detective’s decision to impound his vehicle and inventory the vehicle’s contents was not reasonable because his initial stalking arrest was not supported by probable cause. Second, he argues that the court erred in denying his motion to dismiss based on a violation of his statutory right to a speedy trial. Smith contends that the Supreme Court’s emergency orders suspending jury trials did not toll the six-month period under Idaho Code section 19-3501(2). The district court denied the motion,

applying the Supreme Court's emergency order, and stated that the six-month period to hold a trial under the Idaho Code had not elapsed because in-person trials were prohibited due to the COVID-19 infection rates statewide or in Kootenai County. Third, Smith argues that the district court erred in permitting the prosecutor to introduce evidence of search terms found on his laptop at the trial. Smith argues that the introduction of these search terms was inadmissible evidence in violation of Idaho Rule of Evidence 404(b).