

BOISE, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 2026, AT 11:15 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	
v.)	Docket No. 53609
)	
FREDERICK WILLIAM HARDT,)	
)	
Defendant-Appellant.)	
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Ada County. Patrick Miller, District Judge.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for Appellant.

Raúl R. Labrador, Idaho Attorney General, Boise, for Respondent.

Frederick Hardt appeals his conviction for one count of possession of methamphetamine. During a lawful search of Hardt, police found small white crystals in his jacket pocket, which later tested positive for methamphetamine. Prior to trial, the district court excluded evidence of Hardt's homelessness, including testimony that he obtained the jacket from a homeless shelter. The district court concluded that the evidence was more prejudicial than probative under Idaho Rule of Evidence 403 because it could evoke sympathy from the jury. Following a jury trial, Hardt was convicted and sentenced to a unified term of seven years, with one and a half years fixed. Hardt appealed his conviction to the Idaho Court of Appeals, who affirmed his conviction. Hardt then filed a petition for review to this Court, which was granted.

On appeal, Hardt argues that the district court abused its discretion in excluding such evidence because in doing so, it infringed upon his constitutional right to present highly probative evidence for his defense. He contends that the state bore the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that he knew the substance was present in his jacket pocket and that he either exercised physical control over it or had the power and intent to control it. By excluding evidence of Hardt's homelessness, he was unable to testify that he did not know that there were small crystals of methamphetamine in the jacket he received from a homeless shelter. The State responds that, pursuant to an agreement between the parties, Hardt agreed to not present evidence regarding where he obtained the clothing. Thus, the claim is barred on appeal by the invited error doctrine. The State also asserts that the district court did not abuse its discretion in excluding evidence regarding Hardt's general homelessness status.