



**User Name:** Jeremy Bass

**Date and Time:** Friday, October 25, 2024 4:13:00 PM PDT

**Job Number:** 237026971

## **Document (1)**

1. Download: Brief Analysis: Full Delivery Report

**Client/Matter:** -None-

# Dashboard

## Recommendations (0)








Cases	00
Practical Guidance	00
Treatises	00
Arguments	00

Based on 0 key passage(s) we have identified from your document.

## Similar Briefs (1)

Briefs recommendations based on the legal concepts and citations in your document.

## Cited in your document (3)

	Warning	0
	Questioned	0
	Caution	2
	Positive	0
	Neutral	1
	Unverified	0
	No Signal	0

## Quote Check (3)

1 incorrect and 2 correct quotes identified in your brief

## Jurisdiction (1)

Idaho

## Extracted Concepts (16)

You have selected the following legal concepts in your document:

Legal Issue, Good Cause, Legal Standard, Showing Of Good Cause, Supplemental Declaration, Motion To File, Legal Context, Nez Perce, Writ Of Prohibition, Email, Issue Presented, Permit, Signature, Water, Render, Discretion

## Recommendations

## Concepts extracted from your document (16)

Legal Issue, Good Cause, Legal Standard, Showing Of Good Cause, Supplemental Declaration, Motion To File, Legal Context, Nez Perce, Writ Of Prohibition, Email, Issue Presented, Permit, Signature, Water,

Render, Discretion

## Recommendation (0)

0 passages in your document have recommendations.

## Similar Briefs

### Briefs (1)


1. [MILLENNIAL RESPONDENTS' BRIEF](#), Idaho Supreme Court | June 18, 2024 | 2024 ID S. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 586


**Outcome:** No outcome identified

**Judge:** [Robert C. Naftz](#) | **Counsel:** [Beard St. Clair Gaffney \(Patrick James Davis\)](#) | **Counsel:** [Hall Angell & Associates, LLP \(Blake G. Hall\)](#) | **Counsel:** [Olsen Taggart PLLC \(Nathan M. Olsen\)](#)

**Matching legal concepts from your document:** Legal Standard, Email, Good Cause

**Similar cites from your document:**

 [Hastings v. Idaho Dep't of Water Res.](#) | 547 P.3d 1190

 [La Bella Vita, Ltd. Liab. Co. v. Shuler](#) | 158 Idaho 799, 803

## Cited in your document

### Cited In Your Document (3)

1.  [Reclaim Idaho v. Denney \(In re Writ of Prohibition\)](#)

**Cases** Idaho | August 23, 2021 | 169 Idaho 406

Discussion Level     Cited

**OVERVIEW:** Idaho Code Ann. § 34-1805(2) violated Idaho Const. art. III, § 1 because initiative and referendum powers were fundamental rights reserved to the people, strict scrutiny applied, and a compelling state interest was not shown; SB 1110 was barred from taking effect and the previous version of Idaho Code Ann. § 34-1805 was restored.

2.  [La Bella Vita, LLC v. Shuler](#)

**Cases** Idaho | July 13, 2015 | 158 Idaho 799

Discussion Level     Cited

**OVERVIEW:** Granting a competitor and former employee summary judgment on a salon's misappropriation of trade secrets claim was error as there were genuine issues of fact as to whether a baby shower list and the salon's client list and client-related information was a trade secret under Idaho Code Ann. § 48-801(5) and whether the information was taken or used.

3.  [Hastings v. Idaho Dep't of Water Res.](#)

**Cases** Idaho | April 24, 2024 | 547 P.3d 1190

Discussion Level     Cited

**OVERVIEW:** Summary judgment was properly awarded to the Idaho Department of Water Resources in plaintiff's suit for a declaration that the Department could no longer pursue an enforcement action against him because the Department's enforcement action was not time-barred under Idaho Code Ann. § 42-3809.

## Quote Check

### Quote Check (3)

1.

#### This quote is Incorrect

##### Quote from your brief:

*authority in order to ensure that the court has a comprehensive understanding of the legal standards applicable to the matter at hand. I. INTRODUCTION Idaho courts recognize that a party may be granted leave to submit supplemental authority after a hearing, particularly when it clarifies important legal issues before the court. The Idaho Supreme Court acknowledged in Reclaim Idaho v. Denney that, " The [Plaintiffs] asserted that the declarations were submitted too late for any reply, were unfair to the [Plaintiffs], and [a particular] declaration was too speculative. Typically, a motion to file a supplemental declaration is granted with a showing of good cause. Reclaim Idaho v. Denney (In re Writ of Prohibition), 169 Idaho 406, 417, 497 P.3d 160, 171 (2021). Defendant Bass submits that the supplemental authorities presented here meet the requisite standard of good cause and will assist the Court in resolving the legal issues presented by Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment. II. LEGAL STANDARD The Idaho Supreme Court has consistently held that the*

##### Quote from source citation:

*[T]he [Plaintiffs] asserted that the declarations were submitted too late for any reply, were unfair to . . . the [Plaintiffs] , and [a particular] declaration was too speculative. Typically, a motion to file a supplemental declaration is granted with a showing of good cause.*

**Source Citation:** Reclaim Idaho v. Denney (In re Writ of Prohibition), 169 Idaho 406, 417, 497 P.3d 160, 171 (2021)

2.

#### This quote is Correct

##### Quote from your brief:

*and will assist the Court in resolving the legal issues presented by Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment. II. LEGAL STANDARD The Idaho Supreme Court has consistently held that the court has discretion to permit supplemental submissions to ensure all legal issues are adequately addressed before a ruling is made. For instance, in La Bella Vita, Ltd. Liab. Co. v. Shuler, the court noted that ? [the defendant] agreed to this condition and represented that no additional argument would be offered. On the issue of supplementation, the court ruled from the bench, permitting the submission of the outstanding discovery materials while cautioning the parties that additional argument would not be considered. On the issue of supplementation, the court ruled from the bench, permitting the submission of the outstanding discovery materials while cautioning the parties that additional argument would not be considered? La Bella Vita, Ltd. Liab. Co. v. Shuler, 158 Idaho 799, 803, 353 P.3d 420, 424 (2015). In this case, the supplemental authorities offered by Defendant Bass provide crucial legal context an*

##### Quote from source citation:

*[the defendant] agreed to this condition and represented that no additional argument would be offered. On the issue of supplementation, the court ruled from the bench, permitting the submission of the outstanding discovery materials while cautioning the parties that additional argument would not be considered*

**Source Citation:** La Bella Vita, Ltd. Liab. Co. v. Shuler, 158 Idaho 799, 803, 353 P.3d 420, 424 (2015)

3.

**This quote is Correct****Quote from your brief:**

*In this case, the supplemental authorities offered by Defendant Bass provide crucial legal context and should be considered by the Court in rendering its decision on summary judgment. These authorities do not introduce new arguments or facts; they solely address questions of authority posed to the Defendant during the hearing.*

*Similarly, in Reclaim Idaho v. Denney, the court recognized that ?a motion to file a supplemental declaration is granted with a showing of good cause. Reclaim Idaho v. Denney (In re Writ of Prohibition), 169 Idaho 406, 417, 497 P.3d 160, 171 (2021). Defendant Bass submits that the supplemental authorities presented here provide crucial legal context, meeting the standard of good cause, and will aid the Court in addressing issues raised in the Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment without introducing new arguments or facts.*

*In Hastings v. Id*

**Quote from source citation:**

a motion to file a supplemental declaration is granted with a showing of good cause.

**Source Citation:** Reclaim Idaho v. Denney (In re Writ of Prohibition), 169 Idaho 406, 417, 497 P.3d 160, 171 (2021)