

**UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO COLLEGE OF LAW– BOISE, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11,
2026, AT 11:15 A.M.**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

WADE ALEXZANDER BEST,

)

Petitioner-Appellant,

)

v.

)

Docket No. 53233

STATE OF IDAHO,

)

Respondent.

)

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Bonner County. Barbara A. Buchanan, District Judge.

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

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

Wade Alexzander Best appeals from the district court’s judgment summarily dismissing his petition for post-conviction relief. In the underlying criminal case, Best entered a guilty plea pursuant to *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970) (an “*Alford* plea”) to lewd and lascivious conduct with a child under sixteen. Best subsequently filed a pro se petition for post-conviction relief, asserting several claims which can be classified into two categories: trial errors—consisting of five distinct claims—and ineffective assistance of counsel—consisting of four distinct claims. The district court appointed Best counsel, and Best’s counsel filed a certification stating that the pro se petition adequately set forth Best’s claims.

The State filed a motion for summary disposition pursuant to Idaho Code section 19-4906(c) on the general ground that Best’s filings had failed to raise a genuine issue of material fact. The State also argued Best had failed to present evidence establishing a *prima facie* case of ineffective assistance of counsel and further argued that Best’s second, third, and fourth claims for ineffective assistance of counsel were clearly disproven by the record. The district court granted the State’s motion for summary disposition and dismissed Best’s petition for post-conviction relief, concluding that (1) the trial error claims were precluded under Idaho Code section 19-4901(b) because they could have been raised on direct appeal; and (2) the ineffective assistance of counsel claims were “disproved by the record in the criminal action or [] unsupported by admissible evidence.”

On appeal, Best contends the district court *sua sponte* dismissed his trial error claims and his first claim for ineffective assistance of counsel, pertaining to his trial counsel’s alleged failure to prepare for his case and present a defense, because the State did not address those claims in its motion for summary disposition. He argues the district court erred in summarily dismissing those

claims because it did not provide him twenty-days' notice of its intent to dismiss these claims and an opportunity to respond to its grounds for dismissal pursuant to Idaho Code section 19-4906(b).