

**MONTANA FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
MADISON COUNTY**

<p>STATE OF MONTANA,</p> <p style="text-align:right">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align:center">v.</p> <p>JESSE MICHAEL BOYD, BETHANY GRACE BOYD, CARTER NORMAN PHILLIPS, ERIC ANTHONY TRENT,</p> <p style="text-align:right">Defendant(s).</p>	<p>Cause No(s). DC-29-2022-23 DC-29-2022-24 DC-29-2022-22 DC-29-2022-26</p> <p style="text-align:center">ORDER</p>
--	---

The State of Montana has filed a request for Arrest Warrants for the above-named Defendants and attached documents noting their intention to violate bond conditions. The attached documents indicate the Defendants intend to resume their mission work from the spot in which they were previously arrested.

The Court has reviewed the bond conditions and documents attached to the pleadings. The bond conditions set in District Court ordered the Defendants to “stay away from the victims¹” property. A No Contact Order issued by the Justice of the Peace on November 15, 2022 requires them to stay 1500 feet from the alleged victim “their residence, and place of work, or other known locations.”

While the Court appreciates the sentiment apparently set forth by the Defendants the area in which they were arrested is public property, this is irrelevant to the Court when it comes to a gathering.

¹ The Court notes for purposes of this Order the proper vernacular is “alleged victim.”

The bond conditions serve many purposes. Not only do they monitor if the Defendants will comply with Court Orders, **but they also ensure the safety of any alleged victims, the Defendants themselves, and the general public.**

The Court is unfamiliar with the distance between the alleged victim's property and the area in which the Defendants were arrested to offer a position as to whether gathering there would be a potential violation.

Regardless, the Court does have concern given the animosity which has invaded this case from "supporters" of both sides of this issue as to a gathering in proximity to the alleged victim's property.

Additionally, the Court's previous order to "stay away from the property" may have been vague as written. As the No Contact Order set forth a 1500-foot barrier the Court will use this distance as well. Due to the potential vagueness of the distance expected when Ordered to "stay away" from the property and as no actual violation has occurred the Court declines to act on the State's current request².

The Defendants are free to continue their missionary work. The Defendants are free to pass by, in the normal course of transit (in any mode), property owned by the alleged victim, but the Defendants are not allowed to congregate/stop, for any period, in any area that is within 1500 feet of property owned by the alleged victim. The Defendant's may pass property owned by the alleged victim in a normal manner, but they may not congregate.

² The Court has no authority beyond the obvious statement of "remain law abiding" to members of the public not under Court Order but notes the Defendants may not be immune from an allegation of violating their bond conditions if actions are taken by others on their direct behalf.