

BOISE, MONDAY, MAY 11, 2026, AT 8:45 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

CHASIDY DECKER and ROBERT)
CALACAL,)
)
Plaintiffs-Appellants,)
)
v.)
)
CITY OF MERIDIAN and MAYOR)
ROBERT SIMISON, in his official capacity,)
)
Defendants-Respondents.)
)

Docket No. 52355

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Ada County. Jason D. Scott, District Judge.

Runft Dindinger Kohler PLLC, Boise, and Institute for Justice, Arlington, VA, for Appellants.

Moore Elia Kraft & Stacey, LLP, Boise, for Respondents.

Chasidy Decker and Robert Calacal appeal from the judgment of the district court dismissing their claims against the City of Meridian (the “City”). In 2022, Decker entered a lease agreement with homeowner Calacal. Under the terms of the lease, Calacal allowed Decker to park and live in her “mobile tiny home” on his property in the City. In response to a complaint from a neighbor, an officer from Meridian Code Enforcement inspected Calacal’s property. Over the next several months, the officer and the City informed Decker and Calacal that the living arrangement violated multiple zoning ordinances, including the unified ownership requirement and secondary dwelling unit requirements. Decker eventually moved out of the mobile tiny home on Calacal’s property.

Decker and Calacal filed a complaint against the City alleging that (1) the ordinances violated their substantive due process rights as applied under the Idaho Constitution; (2) the officer’s selective enforcement of City ordinances violated their equal protection rights under the Idaho Constitution; and (3) the officer retaliated against them in response to Decker’s exercise of her right to freedom of speech under the Idaho Constitution. Following a bench trial, the district court dismissed the substantive due process claims without prejudice as nonjusticiable as applied to Decker and Calacal and dismissed the remaining claims with prejudice.

On appeal, Decker and Calacal argue that the district court erred by concluding that the substantive due process claims were nonjusticiable and that the alleged selective enforcement by the City did not violate their equal protection rights.