

SUPREME COURT OF NORTH DAKOTA

State v. Lais

Lais, 2026 ND 12 (N.D. 2026) · No. No. 20250231 · Decided January 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The North Dakota Supreme Court summarily affirmed Shantel Rose Lais’s criminal judgment after she conditionally pleaded guilty to child neglect and unlawful possession of drug paraphernalia. Relying on its decision in *State v. Golberg*, the court held that the prior ruling was dispositive of Lais’s Fourth Amendment challenge to the denial of her motion to suppress evidence.

OPINION

State v. Lais 2026 ND 12

JENSEN, JON J.

IN THE SUPREME COURT

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

2026 ND 12 State of North Dakota, Plaintiff and Appellee v. Shantel Rose Lais, n/k/a Shantel Rose Golberg, Defendant and Appellant No. 20250231 Appeal from the District Court of Mercer County, South Central Judicial District, the Honorable Bobbi B. Weiler, Judge. AFFRIMED. Opinion of the Court by Jensen, Justice, in which Chief Justice Fair McEvers and Justices Tufte and Bahr joined. Justice Crothers filed an opinion dissenting. Todd A. Schwarz, State’s Attorney, Stanton, ND, for plaintiff and appellee; submitted on brief. Jamie L. Schaible, Fargo, ND, for defendant and appellant. State v. Lais No. 20250231 Jensen, Justice. [¶1] Shantel Lais appeals from a criminal judgment entered after she conditionally pleaded guilty to child neglect and unlawful possession of drug paraphernalia. She argues the district court erred when it denied her motion to suppress evidence. She asserts her Fourth Amendment rights were violated because law enforcement illegally entered an area where she had a reasonable expectation of privacy. Lais’s co-defendant, Christopher Golberg, challenged the suppression order on the same grounds in *State v. Golberg*, 2026 ND 11, ___ N.W.3d ___. In that appeal, we decided the court did not err when it declined to suppress evidence after finding no reasonable expectation of privacy existed. *Id.* ¶ 18. For the reasons expressed in *Golberg*, we summarily affirm the judgment entered in this case. See N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(7) (providing for affirmance by summary opinion when “a previous controlling appellate decision is dispositive of the appeal”). [¶2] Lisa Fair McEvers, C.J. Jerod E. Tufte Jon J. Jensen Douglas A. Bahr Crothers, Justice, dissenting. [¶3] I respectfully dissent for the reasons stated in my dissent in *State v. Golberg*, 2026 ND 11. [¶4] Daniel J. Crothers 1

