

S-25-0064 and S-25-0065 *Jordyn Flinn* (Appellee) v. *Adam and Amy Strode* (Appellants)

Appeal from the District Court for Lancaster County, Judge Susan I. Strong

Attorneys: Trevin H. Preble & Cohen W. Preble (Preble Law Firm, PC, LLO for Appellee) and Erik W. Fern (Keating, O’Gara, Nedved & Peter, PC, LLO for Appellants)

Civil: Sufficiency of the evidence to issue a harassment protection order

In 2024, Jordyn Flinn (Appellee) lived next door to Amy and Adam Strode (Appellants). Appellants are law enforcement officers. Appellee filed a petition and affidavit to obtain a harassment protection order against the Appellants. She alleged that they were following her, letting their dog run at large, and installed a flood light that pointed directly at the back of her house and into her bedroom. Based on this, the trial court entered an ex parte protection order. An ex parte order is issued after only one party presents evidence. Because it was an ex parte order, Appellants requested a hearing so that they could be heard. At the hearing, they argued that they installed the lights for a legitimate purpose. They explained that the light was installed because of thefts in the neighborhood, because things had disappeared from their deck, because they had received threats regarding an officer-involved shooting, and because they have a newborn. Following the hearing, the trial court continued the harassment protection order against the Appellants. The Supreme Court ordered this appeal to be transferred from the docket of the Court of Appeals to its docket.

On appeal, Appellants assert that there was not enough evidence to continue the harassment protection order. They argue that a reasonable person would not have found their conduct to be seriously terrifying, threatening, or intimidating. They suggest that the trial court disregarded the statutory requirement that the harassing conduct serve “no legitimate purpose” and that their conduct was lawful and served a legitimate purpose. Appellee argues that the allegations were proven by sworn testimony, pictures, and video that establish Appellants’ conduct met the statutory definition of harassment. The parties have filed briefs with the Nebraska Supreme Court, and the case is ready to be argued. Each side will have ten minutes to argue the case before the Supreme Court and to answer questions from Supreme Court Justices.