

BOISE, TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2026, AT 10:30 A.M.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 50619/50620/50621

STATE OF IDAHO,)
)
 Plaintiff-Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 SHANE VINCENT NIGRO,)
)
 Defendant-Appellant.)
)

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Derrick J. O'Neill, District Judge.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Kiley A. Heffner, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

In these consolidated appeals, Shane Vincent Nigro appeals from his judgments of conviction for possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver and unlawful possession of a firearm (Docket No. 50619), grand theft and burglary (Docket No. 50620), and possession of a controlled substance (Docket No. 50621). Nigro challenges the denial of his motions to suppress in Docket Nos. 50619 and 50621 and argues that the district court imposed excessive sentences in all three cases.

In Docket No. 50619, Nigro argues that the district court erred by denying his motion to suppress because officers unlawfully detained him after completing their community caretaking function and lacked reasonable suspicion to prolong the detention. Nigro further contends that the subsequent search of his vehicle was unlawful because, in violation of the Fourth Amendment, a drug-detection dog trespassed on the exterior of his vehicle before giving its final alert.

In Docket No. 50621, Nigro argues that the district court erred in concluding that he lacked standing to challenge the search of a trailer. Nigro asserts that he was an invited overnight guest and therefore had a reasonable expectation of privacy sufficient to invoke Fourth Amendment protections.

In Docket Nos. 50619, 50620, and 50621, Nigro contends that the district court abused its sentencing discretion by failing to give adequate weight to mitigating factors, including his substance abuse, mental health issues, acceptance of responsibility, and support system.

The State responds that the district court correctly denied Nigro's suppression motions and properly exercised its discretion at sentencing. In Docket No. 50619, the State argues that the officers' actions were justified under the community caretaking function and supported by reasonable suspicion and that the search of Nigro's vehicle was lawful. In Docket No. 50621, the State contends that Nigro lacked a reasonable expectation of privacy in the trailer because he was not an invited guest. The State further argues that the sentences imposed in each case were reasonable and consistent with the applicable sentencing objectives.