

Wendy M. Lewis (5993)
Kathryn N. Nester (13967)
NESTER LEWIS PLLC
40 S. 600 E.
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
wendy@nesterlewis.com
kathy@nesterlewis.com
801-535-4375

Alexander E. Ramos (15234)
LANGFORD RAMOS PLLC
43 E. 400 S.
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
alex@langfordramos.com
801-328-4090

Attorneys for Kouri Darden Richins

**IN THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
SUMMIT COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH**

THE STATE OF UTAH,

Plaintiff

vs.

KOURI DARDEN RICHINS,

Defendant

**DEFENDANT’S OBJECTION TO
STATE’S MOTION TO SEAL AND
REQUEST TO REMOVE
“PRIVATE” CLASSIFICATION
FROM EXHIBITS A AND B**

Case No. 231500139

Judge: Richard Mrazik

“Sunlight is the best disinfectant.” – *Justice Louis Brandeis*

Kouri Darden Richins, by and through counsel, hereby objects to the Motion to Seal filed by the State [Doc. 1423] and the “Motion to Classify” filed by the State resulting in the transformation of the publicly-filed exhibits to private. The State’s

allegation that the Motion contains material misrepresentations is spurious, as the texts underlying the motion are attached for the Court's and the public's review.

The only other factual assertions contained in the motion are the descriptions of the responses of the State during the meet and confer. If the State disagrees with defense counsel's interpretation of their response, they can so state in their response and defense counsel can address any issues in the reply brief. This is how briefing is always done and does not require sealing of a brief or response.

The "purpose" of the motion is to alert the Court of serious witness intimidation, to receive relief in the form of targeted discovery requests, and to put other potential witnesses on notice that these allegations have been made in order to encourage others who have suffered from this improper conduct to come forward and seek relief. Any suggestion otherwise from the State is reckless and wrong. If any potential jurors are exposed to this information and/or negatively influenced by it, the matter can be addressed during voir dire and the State can move for their disqualification. The State has cited no authority whatsoever in support of their request to seal the motion. Their motion is unsupported in fact and law and must be denied.

Furthermore, the defense strenuously objects to the Motion to Classify the Exhibits as "private" filings filed this morning by the State without advance notice to the defense. Exhibits A and B attached to the defense's motion contain nothing about the facts of the case, and are not privileged communications. These exhibits leave no room for doubt or misinterpretation regarding exactly what was said by

investigators connected to the prosecution team. Names and phone numbers of the participants have been redacted. There is no factual reason or legal authority supporting their removal from the public docket. The defense respectfully requests they immediately be reclassified as public filings so the public will be on notice and can report if other similarly-worded communications have been sent out to potential witnesses.

DATED this 26th day of January, 2026.

/s/Kathryn N. Nester
Kathryn N. Nester
Wendy M. Lewis
Alexander E. Ramos
Attorneys for Ms. Richins

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served to all parties VIA the Court's electronic filing system on the 26th day of January, 2026.

/s/ Kathryn N. Nester