

# 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; and NATASHA D.  
ERICKSON, M.D., an individual, and  
TRACY W. JUNGMAN, N.P., an  
individual,

Plaintiffs-Respondents,

v.

DIEGO RODRIGUEZ, an individual,

Defendant-Appellant,

and

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 and an  
unincorporated association,

Defendants.

## **Order Denying Emergency Motion for Reconsideration**

Supreme Court Docket No. 51244-2023

Ada County District Court No.  
CV01-22-06789


An Order Re: Motion to Dismiss Appeal and Motion to Appear Remotely for Oral Argument was entered by this Court on June 27, 2025, requiring Appellant to appear in person at oral argument, and allowing five (5) additional minutes for the parties to argue the Motion to Dismiss Appeal. An EMERGENCY MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND REQUEST FOR STAY OF ENFORCEMENT OF APPEARANCE ORDER DUE TO IMMINENT ARREST RISK was filed by Appellant on June 27, 2025. A NOTICE OF STATUS INQUIRY REGARDING EMERGENCY MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION was filed by Appellant on July 18, 2025. Therefore; after due consideration,

IT IS ORDERED that Appellant's EMERGENCY MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND REQUEST FOR STAY OF ENFORCEMENT OF APPEARANCE ORDER DUE TO

IMMINENT ARREST RISK is DENIED. Rule 37 of the Idaho Appellate Rules provides that there shall be oral argument in all appeals unless (1) all parties stipulate to submit the appeal upon the briefs or (2) the Court orders that the appeal be submitted on the briefs. Unless both parties stipulate in writing to submit this appeal on the briefs, this appeal and the motion to dismiss will be scheduled for oral argument in the ordinary course of business. If Appellant does not appear in person at oral argument, it will not result in a forfeiture of the appeal. Rather, the appeal and motion to dismiss will be decided by the Court based on Appellant's briefing without further argument from Appellant.

Dated July 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025.


By Order of the Supreme Court



---

Robyn M. Brody, Vice Chief Justice

ATTEST:



---

Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk