

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

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE
OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ADA**

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,
vs.

AMMON BUNDY, an individual; AMMON
BUNDY FOR GOVERNOR, a political
organization; DIEGO RODRIGUEZ, an
individual; 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.

Case No. CV01-22-06789

**NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO
IMPROPER CHARACTERIZATION IN
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER AND
DEMAND FOR CLARIFICATION**

COMES NOW Defendant Diego Rodriguez, pro se, and respectfully submits this NOTICE OF OBJECTION AND DEMAND FOR CLARIFICATION in response to the Administrative Order entered on July 29, 2025, by Administrative District Judge Steven Hippler.

In that Order, Judge Hippler states: "*Even if there were merit in Rodriguez's claims...*"

This phrase is prejudicial, unnecessary, and legally improper. Judge Hippler expressly acknowledges that the Administrative District Judge does not have jurisdiction to rule on the merits of matters pending before another trial judge, citing *Two Jinn, Inc. v. Dist. Ct. of the*

Fourth Judicial Dist., 150 Idaho 647, 249 P.3d 840 (2011). Accordingly, any commentary about the merits—especially in a ruling that denies relief purely on jurisdictional grounds—exceeds the scope of the ADJ’s authority and improperly taints the record. Defendant hereby objects to this characterization and demands the following:

1. Clarification or Withdrawal of the Statement.

If Judge Hippler truly believes that Defendant’s claims lack merit, he is respectfully asked to explain on what legal basis such a conclusion is drawn—particularly when the Emergency Motion cited:

- I.R.C.P. 40(d), which bars a disqualified judge from taking further action;
- I.R.C.P. 2.3(b), which requires that a ruling must be served with the court’s filed date stamp to be valid; and
- The record, which contains no such written order, no filing date, and no clerk service regarding Judge Baskin’s alleged oral denial of the disqualification motion.

Defendant respectfully asks:

- If a judge violates the plain text of Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 2.3(b), how then can a challenge to that conduct be considered meritless?
- Are Idaho judges bound by the rules of procedure or not?

2. Preservation of Record and Prevention of Prejudice.

This objection is being made not to challenge the procedural outcome of the motion (which was denied for lack of jurisdiction), but to preserve the record and prevent misuse of this phrase in future filings, appeals, or rulings. Defendant anticipates that opposing counsel may attempt to cite Judge Hippler’s statement to argue that his motions are “without merit” more broadly. Such misuse would be improper and prejudicial.

3. Request for Correction.

Defendant respectfully asks that the Court either:

- Strike the offending phrase from the Order; or

- Clarify that the Administrative Judge expressed no view on the substantive merits, and that any such inference is inappropriate.

4. Reservation of Rights.

Defendant reserves all rights to pursue appellate review or administrative remedies regarding this matter should it result in continued prejudice or be used to justify future adverse rulings.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: July 29th, 2025

By: /s/ Diego Rodriguez
Diego Rodriguez

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify I served a 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

DATED: July 29th, 2025

By: /s/ Diego Rodriguez
Diego Rodriguez