

Michael Duke ISB# 10615

Prosecuting Attorney for the County of Payette

1115 1st Avenue N.

Payette, ID 83661

(208) 642-6096

Fax: (208) 642-6099

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE

STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PAYETTE

STATE OF IDAHO, Plaintiff, v. ANDREA RENEE SHAW, Defendant.	CASE NO.: CR38-26-1685 OBJECTION TO MOTION FOR BOND REDUCTION
---	---

COMES NOW, Michael Duke, Payette County Prosecuting Attorney, and objects to the Defendant's Motion for a reduction in bond. Idaho Criminal Rule 46 and Article I Section 6 of the Idaho Constitution direct the requirements for Bond. Below are the State's arguments in support of its objection.

In Capital cases, where the death penalty is a possibility, the defendant is not entitled to bond, it is discretionary with the Court. I.C.R. 46 (b). This rule agrees with Article I Section 6 of the Idaho Constitution which states "all persons shall be bailable by sufficient sureties, except for capital offenses, where the proof is evident or the presumption great."

In this case, the Defendant is charged with the murder of her two 18-month-old children. Where the Constitution looks at the proof or evidence in order to determine whether bond is appropriate, the State will give a short rundown of evidence that weighs in favor of not allowing bond at all, or in the alternative, keeping a high bond.

At approximately 11:30 AM on May 1st, 2025, the Defendant called dispatch to notify them that her children were dead. She had two 18-month-old children who were fraternal twins. One boy and one Girl. She described them as frozen, which experts would later describe as the effect of rigger, which is the

stiffening of the body after death as the body goes through the earliest stages of decomposition. Both children were lying face down in the bed that they shared.

The Payette Police Department investigated the deaths. In a case where two toddlers die at the same time in the same bed on the same night, there are two major considerations as to the potential cause; environmental and/or criminality. Over the course of their investigation, officers ruled out heat, carbon monoxide poisoning, any other known form of poisoning, and vaccines. The evidence of the scene supports suffocation. The following are their findings.

They discovered that the room would get extraordinarily hot, over 100 degrees, which led to concerns that the children may have died from heat. The Payette County Coroner postulated that heat exposure was the likely cause of death. However, officers were able to rule out heat exposure, as the cause of death throughout the course of their investigation and with the help of medical experts. This is because the chances that exposure to heat resulting in their death was unlikely, where the Defendant described it as their “routine,” meaning the children survived this circumstance every night prior to the night of their death, and the time of death did not correlate with the time of day the room reached over 100 degrees.

Next the Detectives looked at the possibility of carbon monoxide poisoning. However, the toxicology reports from the twins made it clear they were not suffering from carbon monoxide poisoning, as their carboxyhemoglobin saturation was only 3%, which is well within normal range for human beings.

Next the officers looked at illness or other forms of poisoning. They performed a full battery of tests and the only illness detected was that one child had diarrhea and tested positive for rotavirus, which is a common side effect of vaccinations.

Next, the children were vaccinated on April 23, 2025, eight (8) days prior to their deaths. There were no signs that would indicate their deaths were a response to the vaccines, and vaccines were ruled out by the forensic pathologist. They did go to the emergency room on April 24th, the Defendant describing them as being warm and lethargic. Their primary care provider attributed their illness to reactions to vaccines. They were given Tylenol and popsicles and recovered fully. The Defendant described them as having a great day the day prior to their murders. Detectives, with the benefit of three medical doctors, were

able to rule out vaccines as a cause of death.

This leads to the only conceivable explanation, which is that the twins were suffocated. The children had pulmonary vascular congestion and the male had pulmonary edema in addition to pulmonary vascular congestion. According to our expert, these symptoms are consistent with being smothered. They occur when something blocks air from entering the airways, and as the diaphragm expands, it creates a low-pressure condition in the lungs and airways, which can cause the damage described above. This is the cause of death of the twins. It is also the only reasonable explanation for why both would die at the same time, on the same night, in the same room, in the same bed. Only two individuals were home during this period, the twins' parents.

Next, looking at the interview with the Defendant, she began by giving a detailed description of getting up with the kids, feeding them, and putting them down for a nap. After about an hour, she claimed she went in to check on the children to find them deceased. After detectives challenged her on this version of events, the Defendant changed her story several times but emphatically claimed that the children were alive when she got home and checked on them at one or two in the morning. Detectives pointed out this makes her the last one to see the kids alive. She then changes her story and says she didn't know if they were alive when she got home between 1:00-2:00 AM.

The Defendant would then go on to appear on a podcast approximately three (3) days later and endorse the belief that vaccines were responsible for the death of the twins.

Now, returning to the bond argument, the State believes that the facts presented above show that the circumstances of this case support no bail. The Court was generous in granting a \$2,000,000 bond, which, in the State's opinion, the Defendant is not entitled to.

Furthermore, the possibility of additional violations of law is another factor weighing in favor of no bond. I.C.R. 46(c)(8). In this case, the Defendant wants to be released from custody so she can provide care for her newborn child. At the initial request for a warrant, the State did not know the Defendant had a newborn. Now that we are aware, we renew our argument that the Defendant should not be granted bail. She is accused of murdering her own 18-month-old children, and while she enjoys the presumption of

innocence, the consequences of her release, in light of the arguments above, cannot be remedied if she were to reoffend.

Therefore, the State respectfully requests that the bond either be revoked, or that it remains as set.

DATED this 13 day of July, 2026.



Michael Duke
Payette County Prosecuting Attorney

CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

I hereby certify that on the 13 day of July, 2026, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be forwarded with all required charges prepaid, by the method(s) indicated below to the person(s) listed below:

Joseph P. Filicetti
P.O. Box 449
Boise, ID 83701

Hand Delivery ☐

U.S. Mail ☐

Facsimile ☐

Email/E-File ☒



Michael Duke
Prosecuting Attorney