

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

STATE OF IDAHO

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHAD GUY DAYBELL,

Defendant.

Case No. CR22-21-1623

**ORDER**

On July 30, 2022, the Court received three (3) motions from proposed intervenor and movant, Lori Hellis (“Hellis”), appearing pro se: (1) MOTION TO INTERVENE; (2) MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF; and (3) MOTION TO UNSEAL ALL DOCUMENTS AND TRANSCRIPTS OR RECORDINGS OF PAST HEARINGS. Hellis supported her motions with memoranda and a DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO INTERVENE AND MOTION TO UNSEAL AND MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

The record indicates that Hellis is pro se. In Idaho, pro se litigants are held to the same standards as attorneys. *Huff v. Singleton*, 143 Idaho 498, 500, 148 P.3d 1244, 1246 (2006); *Everhart v. Washington County Road & Bridge Dep't*, 130 Idaho 273, 275, 939 P.2d 849, 851 (1997); *Schneider v. Curry*, 106 Idaho 264, 267, 678 P.2d 56, 59 (Ct.App.1984).<sup>1</sup>

Motion to Intervene

In the MOTION TO INTERVENE, Hellis cites to Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 24 and Idaho Court Administrative Rule 32 as the authority to intervene into a criminal case. In addition, Hellis

<sup>1</sup> Hellis' motions and pleadings supporting the motions each fail to conform with Idaho Criminal Rule 2.3(a)(4), which sets forth the form of pleadings required in the State of Idaho. Nonetheless, in the interest of judicial efficiency, the Court herein addresses these pleadings but will reject any future pleadings that do not comply with those basic and mandatory pleading requirements.











