

Diego Rodriguez
1317 Edgewater Drive #5077
Orlando, FL 32804
(208) 891-7728

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

ST. LUKE’S HEALTH SYSTEM, LTD; ST.
LUKE’S REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER,
LTD; CHRIS ROTH, an individual; NATASHA
D. ERICKSON, MD, an individual; and TRACY
W. JUNGMAN, NP, an individual,

Plaintiffs/Respondents,
vs.

DIEGO RODRIGUEZ, an individual,

Defendant/Appellant,

AMMON BUNDY, an individual; AMMON
BUNDY FOR GOVERNOR, a political
organization; FREEDOM MAN PRESS LLC, a
limited liability company; FREEDOM MAN
PAC, a registered political action committee; and
PEOPLE’S RIGHTS NETWORK, a political
organization,

Defendants.

Idaho Supreme Court Case No. 51244-2023

Ada County Case No. CV01-22-06789

**FORMAL SUPPLEMENT REGARDING
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT,
STRUCTURAL BIAS, AND
CONSTITUTIONAL DEFECTS IN
PANEL COMPOSITION**

Appellant Diego Rodriguez respectfully files this Supplement to support his Motion to Disqualify Chief Justice Richard G. Bevan, and to provide the Court with a formal record of institutional conflicts and structural improprieties relevant to impartial adjudication.

I. INCORPORATION OF JUDICIAL COMPLAINT

Appellant attaches and incorporates by reference the judicial complaint filed with the Idaho Judicial Council on August 14, 2025, titled: “*Judicial Complaint Against Chief Justice Richard G. Bevan*” Pages 1–6 .

This Complaint documents:

- Repeated unexplained denials of constitutional motions;
- Contradictions between Bevan's public policy and private rulings;
- Conflicts of interest involving Judge Nancy Baskin;
- The Chief Justice's enabling of jurisdictionally void proceedings below;
- A pattern of judicial protectionism;
- Conduct undermining Canon 1, 2, and 3 of the Idaho Code of Judicial Conduct.

II. STRUCTURAL BIAS AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPTURE

Evidence demonstrates:

- Chief Justice Bevan shields Judge Baskin.
- Both sit on the Judicial Council.
- All denials aided Baskin's unlawful continuation under I.R.C.P. 40(d).
- The Supreme Court's supervisory role has been obstructed.
- This case has triggered contempt warrants weaponized to suppress participation.

This constitutes structural bias under Caperton.

III. DUE PROCESS IMPLICATIONS

The pattern of silence, arbitrary denials, and institutional entanglement creates:

- A constitutionally intolerable risk of bias (Caperton).
- Structural error (Tumey).
- Denial of meaningful access to the courts (Goldberg v. Kelly).
- Violations of Canon 2.11 (mandatory disqualification).

IV. REQUEST FOR ACTION

Appellant requests that the Court:

1. Formally recognize the documented misconduct;
2. Accept and file this Supplement as part of the appellate record;
3. Consider all evidence herein in ruling on the Motion to Disqualify.

V. VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: November 15th, 2025

By: /s/ Diego Rodriguez

Diego Rodriguez

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I served a true and correct copy to:

Erik F. Stidham (ISB #5483)
HOLLAND & HART LLP
800 W. Main Street, Suite 1750
Boise, ID 83702-5974

☐ By Mail
☐ By fax
☒ By Email/iCourt/eServe

Ammon Bundy
4615 Harvest Lane
Emmett, ID 83617

☐ By Mail
☐ By fax
☒ By Email/iCourt/eServe

DATED: November 15th, 2025

By: /s/ Diego Rodriguez
Diego Rodriguez

JUDICIAL COMPLAINT AGAINST IDAHO CHIEF JUSTICE RICHARD BEVAN

August 14th, 2025

Idaho Judicial Council
P.O. Box 1397
Boise, ID 83701

To the Idaho Judicial Council –

I. INTRODUCTION

I, Diego Rodriguez, file this judicial complaint against *Chief Justice Richard Bevan of the Idaho Supreme Court*, not with the expectation of redress from this body, but to formally document a pattern of judicial bias, willful neglect of duty, and systemic protectionism within the Idaho judiciary. This complaint is submitted for the record and to preserve my constitutional objections against the unlawful and discriminatory treatment I have received in the Idaho courts.

II. SUMMARY OF THE CONDUCT COMPLAINED OF

Chief Justice Bevan has, in three separate instances, denied my lawful, procedurally proper, and jurisdictionally sound motions—without explanation, legal reasoning, or acknowledgment of the substantive constitutional concerns raised therein.

This complaint is not based on dissatisfaction with the outcomes alone. Rather, it is based on the pattern of unexplained denials, in defiance of clear legal authority and fundamental principles of due process, which suggest bias, arbitrariness, or improper coordination with other members of the judiciary. These are not speculative or frivolous concerns—they stem from specific violations of Idaho law, judicial canons, and Supreme Court policy statements.

1. Denial of Motion to Appear Remotely

On May 29, 2025, I filed a motion to appear remotely in the appeal of a \$52.5 million defamation judgment from a highly visible court case—the “Baby Cyrus” case. I am a self-represented litigant residing over 2,000 miles away in Florida, with limited financial means and no legal representation. This motion was not only procedurally proper and timely—it was fully supported by Idaho’s own judicial policy statements promoting remote access to justice. In fact, Chief Justice Bevan himself signed the Idaho Supreme Court’s January 6, 2023 memorandum which formally endorsed remote court participation, stating that it reduces travel burdens, lowers costs, and improves public access to justice, and reduces unnecessary burdens on litigants. Despite this, he denied my motion without explanation, citation, or acknowledgment of his own policy initiative or acknowledgment of the arguments raised. This contradiction reflects a troubling disparity between the Court’s public

proclamations and its internal conduct—especially when applied to disfavored or self-represented parties.

By denying the motion without any explanation, Chief Justice Bevan created a *procedural trap*. Because I apparently have civil contempt warrants still pending in Idaho—which are a result of this very lawsuit itself—any physical return to the state would likely result in my immediate arrest and incarceration. Thus, denying remote appearance effectively stripped me of the ability to participate in my own appeal—unless I was willing to submit to incarceration. This transforms what should have been a neutral procedural ruling into a coercive mechanism that violated due process and exposed me to unnecessary harm.

2. Denial of Renewed Motion to Appear Remotely with Demand for Reasoning

After the initial denial, and a subsequent denial of a *Motion to Reconsider* (which was signed by Vice Chief Justice Robyn Brody, and which likewise contained no explanation for its denial), I filed a *Renewed Motion to Appear Remotely*, which explicitly requested a legal justification for the Court's refusal. The renewed motion specifically invoked the Idaho judiciary's own stated policy on access to justice and the right to be heard—principles that Chief Justice Bevan himself had endorsed in his official memorandum dated January 6, 2023, where he stated: “...courts have found remote proceedings enhance litigants' access to justice by reducing travel time, reducing some litigation costs, increasing victim safety, increasing participation by certain individuals, and generally increasing efficiency in many proceedings.”¹

I also emphasized that the right to be heard cannot be meaningfully exercised if the only option available requires a self-represented litigant to travel thousands of miles and risk incarceration.

And to emphasize the need for an explanation, I cited the U.S. Supreme Court's holding in *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254, 271 (1970): “The decision maker should state the reasons for his determination.”

In addition, I pointed to Canon 2.6(A) of the Idaho Code of Judicial Conduct, which states that every person has “the right to be heard according to law.” Chief Justice Bevan again denied the motion with *no explanation*, no citation, and no response to the constitutional, practical, or human implications raised. His silence elevated the denial from a mere discretionary ruling into an act of procedural entrapment—blocking access while offering no alternative but personal risk and physical hardship.

The *Renewed Motion to Appear Remotely* made clear that a denial of a remote appearance—when such appearances are routine, legally sufficient, and necessary due to geography and finances—requires a legal explanation to avoid the appearance of arbitrary or biased conduct.

Chief Justice Bevan again denied the motion without any explanation, citation, or reference to the constitutional and due process arguments I raised. This complete silence in the face of specific, lawful, and reasonable requests suggests willful disregard—not mere oversight—and violates not only judicial ethics but fundamental principles of fair access to the courts.

¹ Idaho Supreme Court Memorandum on Remote Proceedings, signed by Chief Justice Richard Bevan, January 6, 2023.

3. Denial of Petition for Supervisory Relief

On July 29, 2025, I filed a *Verified Petition for Supervisory Relief* with the Idaho Supreme Court, supported by extensive documentation of a live jurisdictional breakdown in Ada County Case No. CV01-22-06789. The petition detailed:

- That Judge Nancy Baskin was presiding over the case despite a valid and timely *Motion to Disqualify* under I.R.C.P. 40(b) having been filed on June 14, 2024;
- That no written order denying that motion was ever entered or served in violation of I.R.C.P. 2.3(b);
- That under I.R.C.P. 40(d), Judge Baskin was barred from taking further action in the case absent a formal denial of the motion (in accordance with I.R.C.P. 2.3(b));
- That as a result, all subsequent rulings and proceedings in the case were issued without jurisdiction and are *void ab initio*;
- That I filed an *Emergency Motion to Enforce Disqualification* with the Administrative District Judge, who expressly declined to act and referred the matter to the Idaho Supreme Court;
- That the petition cited the Supreme Court's original jurisdiction under Idaho Const. art. V, § 9, Idaho Code § 1-203, and I.A.R. 5(a) as the only remaining authority able to resolve the disqualification crisis.

This was not a speculative or political dispute—it was a pure question of legal process and judicial authority. The Petition asked the Court to intervene before a hearing scheduled for August 19, 2025, to prevent further unlawful proceedings.

When Chief Justice Bevan did respond, it was a one-line denial with no explanation, no citation, and no engagement with the grave legal issues presented.

This marked the third time Chief Justice Bevan had denied a legally proper motion of constitutional significance (see points 1 and 2 above) without explanation or justification. In each instance, the denial enabled continued judicial misconduct by Judge Baskin and shielded her from accountability, despite plain violations of Idaho procedural rules and constitutional guarantees of due process.

In all three instances, Chief Justice Bevan failed to meet even the minimal standard of transparency required under Idaho's own judicial ethics rules. His continued silence—despite binding precedent requiring reasoned rulings when constitutional rights are implicated—suggests that these denials were not merely administrative, but strategic.

III. GROUNDS FOR JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

The above conduct constitutes violations of the Idaho Code of Judicial Conduct, including but not limited to:

- **Canon 1: Upholding the Integrity and Independence of the Judiciary**

Chief Justice Bevan's repeated refusal to provide reasoning for denials—especially on matters involving due process and access to justice—undermines public confidence in judicial integrity.

- **Canon 2: Avoiding Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety**

The Chief Justice is aware that his actions are part of a broader pattern of protectionism within the Idaho courts. His silent denials functionally protect a subordinate judge (Nancy Baskin) from accountability, giving the appearance of coordinated misconduct.

- **Canon 3: Performing Judicial Duties Impartially and Diligently**

A judge must respond to legitimate claims, particularly constitutional and jurisdictional claims, with diligence and impartiality. Summary denials without comment in such situations demonstrate an abdication of judicial duty and suggest prejudice or bias.

IV. CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND JUDICIAL PROTECTIONISM

It is important to note that *Chief Justice Richard Bevan* and *Judge Nancy Baskin* both serve as members of the *Idaho Judicial Council*, the very body tasked with overseeing judicial ethics, misconduct complaints, and enforcement of standards. This overlapping role creates an obvious and disqualifying conflict of interest, as it empowers them to shield each other from scrutiny—whether formally through Council authority or informally through institutional loyalty.

In this case:

- Chief Justice Bevan has issued three unexplained denials of motions: two that sought to secure the basic right to appear remotely and be heard before the Idaho Supreme Court, and one (a Petition for Supervisory Relief) that sought accountability for Judge Baskin's jurisdictional misconduct under I.R.C.P. 40(d).
- Despite the Petition citing judicial misconduct, jurisdictional violations, and violations of Idaho Rules of Civil Procedure, Bevan declined to even acknowledge the substance of the allegations;
- Bevan's denials have directly enabled Judge Baskin to continue presiding over a case in which she has been procedurally disqualified—undermining not only the fairness of the case, but the integrity of Idaho's judicial process.

This situation is not merely unethical—it raises concerns of structural corruption within Idaho's judiciary. The *dual role* of Chief Justice Bevan as both *gatekeeper of Supreme Court appeals* and *member of the body responsible for overseeing judicial conduct* creates a self-reinforcing protection mechanism for misconduct.

At minimum, the appearance of impropriety is overwhelming and disqualifying. At worst, it constitutes a breach of the public trust, violating both the Idaho Code of Judicial Conduct (Canon 1 and 2) and the constitutional principle of *due process*.

The combination of Bevan's silence, judicial inaction, and administrative control over complaints involving his own colleague on the Council represents a textbook case of *institutional capture*—where judicial oversight is not merely ineffective but functionally compromised.

V. SYSTEMIC CONTEXT

Chief Justice Bevan's conduct cannot be viewed in isolation. As previously mentioned, he sits on the *Idaho Judicial Council*—the very body tasked with investigating complaints such as this. This structural conflict of interest raises serious concerns about the ability of the Council to independently evaluate misconduct claims involving its own leadership.

Furthermore, the Idaho Supreme Court's continued suppression of jurisdictional objections and constitutional rights presented by self-represented parties reflects a systemic disregard for due process. Chief Justice Bevan is at the center of this pattern, having denied relief without explanation on multiple occasions involving fundamental rights.

Should independent oversight ever be undertaken by the federal judiciary, U.S. Department of Justice, or civil liberties organizations, this record may serve as a critical evidentiary starting point.

V. REQUEST FOR RECORDATION

Given the inherent conflicts within the Judicial Council and its lack of independence from the judiciary it purports to regulate, I do not request intervention or disciplinary action. I request only that this Complaint be formally received and recorded, so that future oversight bodies—whether state, federal, or public interest groups—may have an accurate record of the coordinated judicial misconduct and bias occurring in Idaho.

VI. VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

This filing is made in the interest of judicial accountability and to safeguard the constitutional rights of litigants across Idaho.

Executed on: August 14th, 2025

Diego Rodriguez
1317 Edgewater Dr #5077
Orlando, FL 32804
(208) 891-7728
freedommanpress@protonmail.com

JURAT

STATE OF FLORIDA, COUNTY OF _____

Sworn to (or affirmed) and subscribed before me this _____ day of

_____, 2025, by _____.

Signature of Notary Public

Print, Type or Stamp Name of Notary

Personally Known: _____

OR Produced Identification: _____

Type of Identification Produced: _____