

BOISE, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2026 AT 11:15 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| HMI, HAMILTON MANUFACTURING, |) | |
| INC. an Idaho corporation; and CHRISTY |) | |
| HAMILTON f/k/a CHRISTY HAMILTON |) | |
| EAMES, an individual, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiffs-Appellants, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | |
| |) | Docket No. 52620 |
| CITY OF TWIN FALLS, a municipal |) | |
| corporation; and JON CATON, an |) | |
| individual, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants-Respondents, |) | |
| |) | |
| and |) | |
| |) | |
| JOHN/JANE DOES 1-10, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Twin Falls County. Benjamin J. Cluff, District Judge.

Benoit Alexander & Mollerup, PLLC, Twin Falls, for Appellants.

Castleton Law, PLLC, Boise, for Respondents.

This appeal concerns the existence and location of two utility easements on real property owned by Christy Hamilton, for underground water and sewer lines owned by the City of Twin Falls (the “City”). Hamilton operates a manufacturing business, Hamilton Manufacturing, Inc. (collectively, “HMI”), on three adjoining parcels in Twin Falls, Idaho. In 2018, one of the City’s water lines developed a large leak requiring excavation and repair of the water line on Hamilton’s property near, and partially underneath, the HMI manufacturing building.

HMI subsequently filed a lawsuit against the City, claiming trespass and nuisance related to the water and sewer lines that run through Hamilton’s property. The City defended against these claims on the basis that it possesses easements, either express or prescriptive, for these water and sewer lines. After a bench trial, the district court dismissed Hamilton’s trespass and nuisance claims. The court determined that the City held either an express easement for the sewer line or,

in the alternative, a prescriptive easement. The district court further concluded that the City established a prescriptive easement for the water line.

On appeal, HMI argues that the district court erred by concluding that the City owned an express easement for the sewer line because the court failed (1) to give meaning to all the language of the instrument granting the express easement, and (2) to resolve the instrument's latent ambiguities. HMI also argues, among other things, that the district court failed to properly evaluate whether the City established prescriptive easements for the water line and sewer line because the subject property was wild, unenclosed, and unimproved at the time the lines were installed, and, therefore, the installation was presumptively permissive.