

POCATELLO, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2026, AT 8:45 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

JEANETTE D. RAY,

**Petitioner-Respondent-Cross
Appellant,**

v.

WYMAN D. RAY,

**Respondent-Appellant-Cross
Respondent.**

Docket Nos. 53255 & 53262

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Bear Lake County. Cody L. Brower, District Judge. Paul S. Laggis, Magistrate Judge.

Cache Defenders Office, Logan, Utah, and Pendlebury Law Office, PA, Idaho Falls, for Appellant-Cross Respondent.

Parsons Behle & Latimer, Idaho Falls, for Respondent-Cross Appellant.

This case concerns Jeanette D. Ray's petition to modify the child custody provisions of the divorce decree between her and Wyman D. Ray. Jeanette sought sole legal and physical custody but subsequently modified the relief sought and requested that Wyman's visitation be further restricted. She alleged that Wyman had physical altercations with the children, that his parenting style created an unstable home environment, and that it was the children's desire to have limited visitation. Wyman filed a counterclaim, seeking 50-50 physical custody and alleging that Jeanette was alienating the children from him.

Following a court trial on the motion and counterclaim, the magistrate court ordered that Wyman's visitation be adjusted to alternating weekend day visits and weekly evening visits on Wednesday and Thursday. The magistrate court also ordered that the children could refuse visitation with Wyman at their discretion, that the parents shall not interfere with the children's extracurricular activities, and that Jeanette had no affirmative duty to inform Wyman of the children's extracurricular activities.

Wyman appealed the magistrate court's decision to the district court. Wyman argued, among other things, that the magistrate court improperly granted the children authority to decide whether to have visitation, improperly refused to admit or consider evidence of alienation, made inconsistent factual findings, failed to correctly analyze his alienation claim, and failed to consider relevant factors related to the best interests of the children.

The district court affirmed the magistrate court's order in part after concluding that there was substantial and competent evidence warranting modification and that the magistrate court did not err in granting the children authority over visitation with Wyman, did not make inconsistent findings of fact, and adequately considered the relevant factors concerning the best interests of the children.

However, the district court reversed the portion of the magistrate court's decision refusing to admit a several year-old affidavit from Jeanette's and Wyman's son, vacated the magistrate court's order that Jeanette did not have to advise Wyman of the children's extracurricular activities, and vacated its order that Wyman not interfere with the children's extracurricular activities. The district court also concluded that the magistrate court improperly analyzed Wyman's alienation claim. The district court remanded the case to the magistrate court for further proceedings.

Wyman now appeals the district court's intermediate appellate decision. Wyman reasserts the arguments rejected by the district court. Jeanette cross appeals those portions of the district court's decision reversing the magistrate court's evidentiary ruling and vacating portions of the magistrate court's order.