

R. James Archibald, Esq.
Attorney at Law
Idaho State Bar #4445
1493 North 1070 East
Shelley, Idaho 83274
Telephone (208) 317-2908
Email: jimarchibald21@gmail.com
Attorney for Defendant

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE SEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR FREMONT COUNTY

<p>STATE OF IDAHO, Plaintiff/Respondent, vs. LORI NORENE VALLOW aka LORI NORENE DAYBELL, Defendant/Appellant.</p>	<p>Case No. CR22-21-1624</p> <p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p>
---	--

TO: THE ABOVE-NAMED RESPONDENT, STATE OF IDAHO, AND THE PARTY'S
ATTORNEYS, LINDSEY A. BLAKE, FREMONT COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY,
22 W. 1ST NORTH, ST. ANTHONY, IDAHO, 83445, AND ROBERT H. WOOD, MADISON
COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY, 159 E. MAIN ST., REXBURG, IDAHO, 83440,
AND THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT:

1. The above-named appellant, Lori Norene Vallow aka Lori Norene Daybell, appeals against the above-named respondent to the Idaho Supreme Court from the Judgment of Conviction entered on August 2, 2023, Honorable Steven W. Boyce, presiding.

2. The party has a right to appeal to the Idaho Supreme Court, and the judgments or orders described in paragraph 1 above are appealable orders under and pursuant to Rule 11(c)(1-9), Idaho Appellate Rules (I.A.R.).

3. A preliminary statement of the issues on appeal which the appellant then intends to assert in the appeal; provided, any such list of issues on appeal shall not prevent the appellant from asserting other issues on appeal:

(a) Did the court err in its order dated April 11, 2022, wherein the court found that the defendant, after spending 10 months in a mental hospital, was competent to stand trial?

(b) Did the court err in its order dated November 15, 2022, wherein the court denied the defense experts requests to send the defendant back to the mental hospital rather than proceed to trial?

(c) Was the defendant's constitutional and statutory right to a speedy trial violated by the government's repeated requests for a continuance?

(d) Was the defendant's constitutional and statutory right to a speedy trial violated by the court's trial setting?

(e) Did the court err in denying defense challenges for cause of trial jurors due to bias or hardship during jury selection?

(f) Did the government commit fundamental reversible error in its opening statement to the jury?

(g) Did the court err in allowing the government to produce evidence of other crimes or acts against the defendant under Rule 404(b), Idaho Rules of Evidence?

(h) Did the court err in allowing the government to exceed the scope of its order regarding other crimes or acts against the defendant under Rule 404(b), Idaho Rules of Evidence?

(i) Did the court err in allowing the government to amend the grand jury indictment two years after the indictment was filed without sending the case back to the grand jury?

(j) Did the court err in allowing the jury to hear statements of co-conspirators, but then rule in jury instructions that the government need not prove those persons were part of the conspiracy?

(k) When the grand jury indictment puts the defendant on notice that she is charged with a conspiracy involving five or more people, can the trial court ignore that finding and instead proceed with standard conspiracy jury instructions?

(l) Did the government commit fundamental reversible error in its closing statement to the jury?

(m) Did the court err when it granted, without a hearing, the government's objection to the defense request for the court to review all mitigation evidence submitted by the defense for sentencing?

(n) Should a new sentencing hearing be held due to the sentencing court not reviewing all mitigation evidence submitted by the defense?

(o) Did the sentencing court abuse its discretion by ordering the defendant to serve three consecutive fixed life sentences without parole?

(p) Did the sentencing court abuse its discretion when it ordered the defendant, who had been found indigent, qualified for a public defender, and had just been ordered to serve life in prison without parole, to pay \$165,018.00 in fines and court costs?

4. There is a portion of the record that is sealed, including all the mental health reports of the defendant and the presentence report.

5. The appellant requests the preparation of the entire reporter's standard transcript as defined in I.A.R. 25(d). The appellant also requests the preparation of additional portions of the reporter's transcript to include:

(a) the hearings on defendant's competency to stand trial,

(b) the hearings to determine if defendant should be sent back to the mental hospital,

(c) all pretrial hearings on motions, including motions to remand the case back to the grand jury, motions to determine if character evidence was appropriate and the scope of that evidence, motions regarding the government's discovery violations, motions regarding the death penalty,

(d) all hearings at the jury trial including voir dire, opening statements, closing statements, jury instruction conferences, return of verdict, any argument on motions or objections, and any polling of the jurors,

(e) all hearings between the jury trial and the sentencing, including motions for a new trial, motions regarding victim impact statements, and objections to the presentence report,

(f) sentencing hearing.

