

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

SUPREME COURT DOCKET NO. 50482-2023

County of Latah No. CR29-22-2805

In Re: Petition for Writ of Mandamus or Writ of Prohibition.

---

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS; RADIO TELEVISION DIGITAL NEWS ASSOCIATION; SINCLAIR MEDIA OF BOISE, LLC/KBOI-TV (BOISE); THE MCCLATCHY COMPANY, LLC; STATES NEWSROOM dba IDAHO CAPITAL SUN; THE SEATTLE TIMES; TEGNA INC./KREM (SPOKANE), KTVB (BOISE) AND KING (SEATTLE); EASTIDAHONEWS.COM; THE LEWISTON TRIBUNE; WASHINGTON STATE ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS; ADAMS PUBLISHING GROUP dba POST REGISTER; IDAHO PRESS CLUB; IDAHO EDUCATION NEWS; KXLY-TV/4 NEWS NOW AND KAPP/KVEW-TV—MORGAN MURPHY MEDIA KXLY-TV/4 NEWS NOW; SCRIPPS MEDIA, INC., dba KIVI-TV, a Delaware corporation; BOISE STATE PUBLIC RADIO; THE TIMES-NEWS; THE SPOKESMAN- REVIEW/COWLES COMPANY; COEUR D'ALENE PRESS; THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY; DAY365 dba BOISEDEV; LAWNEWZ, INC.; SCRIPPS MEDIA, INC., a Delaware corporation; ABC, INC.; WP COMPANY LLC, dba THE WASHINGTON POST; SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS,

Petitioners,

vs.

SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, COUNTY OF LATAH;  
HONORABLE MEGAN E. MARSHALL, MAGISTRATE JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

BRYAN C. KOHBERGER and STATE OF IDAHO, LATAH COUNTY PROSECUTOR,

Intervenor-  
Respondents.

---

**ERRATA**

---

For Petitioners

WENDY J. OLSON, ISB No. 7634  
wendy.olson@stoel.com  
CORY M. CARONE, ISB No. 11422  
cory.carone@stoel.com  
**STOEL RIVES LLP**  
101 S. Capitol Boulevard, Suite 1900  
Boise, ID 83702-7705

For Respondents

DEBORAH A. FERGUSON, ISB No. 533  
CRAIG H. DURHAM, ISB No. 6428  
**Ferguson Durham, PLLC**<sub>x</sub>

For Intervenor-Respondents


ANNE C. TAYLOR, ISB No. 5836  
JAY W. LOGSDON, ISB No. 8759  
[pdfax@kcgov.us](mailto:pdfax@kcgov.us)  
**Kootenai County Public Defender**  
PO BOX 9000  
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83816

WILLIAM W. THOMPSON, JR. ISB No.  
2613  
BRADLEY J. RUDLEY, ISB No. 9555  
paservice@latahcountyid.gov  
**Latah County Prosecutor's Office**  
PO BOX 8068  
Moscow, ID 83843-0568

On page iii of the Intervenor-Respondent Bryan C. Kohberger's Brief in Response to the Petition for a Writ of Mandamus or a Writ of Prohibition the titles of parts II B and C of the brief are incorrect and part D is missing entirely. Attached is the correct Table of Contents.

DATED this   3   day of March, 2023.

ANNE C. TAYLOR, PUBLIC DEFENDER  
KOOTENAI COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

BY:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAY WESTON LOGSDON  
CHIEF DEPUTY LITIGATION  
ASSIGNED ATTORNEY

**CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was personally served as indicated below on the   3   day of March, 2023 addressed to:

Second Judicial District of the State of Idaho,  
County of Latah  
Attn: Roland Gammill  
Trial Court Administrator  
Latah County Courthouse  
  X   Via Email:  
[TCA2@co.nepierce.id.us](mailto:TCA2@co.nepierce.id.us)

Deborah A. Ferguson  
Attorney for Hon. Megan E. Marshall  
223 N. 6th Street, Suite 325 Boise, ID 83702  
  X   Via iCourt efile & serve at  
[daf@fergusondurham.com](mailto:daf@fergusondurham.com)

Wendy Olson  
Attorney for Petitioners  
  X   Via iCourt efile & serve at:  
[wendy.olson@stoel.com](mailto:wendy.olson@stoel.com)

Bradley Rudley  
Attorney for Potential Real Party in Interest  
  X   Via Email:  
[paservice@latahcountyid.gov](mailto:paservice@latahcountyid.gov)



---

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORTIES .....	iv
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	1
A. Nature of the Case.....	1
B. Statement of the Facts and Course of Proceedings.....	1
ISSUES PRESENTED .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	4
I. Whether a writ of mandamus or prohibition is the proper vehicle for the media’s request .....	4
A. Introduction .....	4
B. Standard of Review .....	4
C. The extraordinary writ of mandamus is inappropriate in this case where the media has the ability to move to amend the nondissemination order at the trial court level .....	5
D. The extraordinary write of prohibition is inappropriate in this case because the media is not requesting the magistrate refrain from something .....	6
II. Whether the amended nondissemination order violates the First Amendment.....	7
A. Introduction .....	7
B. The legal standard for nondissemination orders for attorneys and their agents is reasonableness .....	7
C. The part of the amended nondissemination order that is merely a restatement of I.R.P.C. 3.6 cmt. 5 did not require specific findings or a hearing before it was entered .....	10
D. The part of the amended nondissemination order that prohibits any statement concerning the case below is not appropriate for mandamus relief.....	11
CONCLUSION .....	12
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING .....	13