

**THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**MERRIMACK, SS**

**SUPERIOR COURT**

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**v.**

**LOGAN CLEGG**

**No. 217-2022-CR-1226**

**STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION**

NOW COMES the State of New Hampshire, by and through its attorneys, the Office of the Attorney General, and provides this response to the defendant's Objection to State's Motion to Reopen Suppression Hearing for Additional Evidence. In support of this pleading, the State submits the following:

1. On October 23, 2023, after a jury trial, the defendant was convicted of two counts of knowing second-degree murder, two alternative counts of reckless second-degree murder, four counts of falsifying physical evidence, and one count of being a felon in possession of a firearm. The defendant's convictions all relate to the deaths of Stephen and Djeswende Reid in Concord, NH on April 18, 2022, and subsequent actions the defendant took to conceal his role in the murders.

2. The defendant appealed his convictions to the New Hampshire Supreme Court. On March 17, 2026, the Court issued an order vacating the trial court's denial of the defendant's pre-trial motion to suppress, and remanded for the limited purpose of deciding whether the defendant's motion to suppress should have been denied on the basis of the inevitable discovery doctrine. The Court's order directed that "the trial court shall hold any further proceedings it deems necessary to resolve this issue and report its findings and rulings to this court." *State v.*

*Clegg*, 2026 N.H. 11, ¶ 33 (2026).

3. On March 20, 2026, this court held a hearing to address scheduling and related matters, in light of the Supreme Court’s order. At the hearing, the defense argued that this court could not conduct an evidentiary hearing unless it made an explicit ruling that it was necessary to do so. In response to this argument, this court explicitly stated that the court deemed it necessary to conduct an evidentiary hearing.

4. The defendant has filed a pleading in which he again argues that this court should not hold an evidentiary hearing. The defendant acknowledges that this court has the discretion to do so, but argues that this court was mistaken in finding that further proceedings are necessary. Def. Mtn., ¶ 14-15.

5. The defendant’s motion, although styled as an objection, is in fact a motion to reconsider. “A motion for reconsideration allows a party to present points of law or fact that the Court has overlooked or misapprehended.” *Smith v. Shepard*, 144 N.H. 262, 264 (1999). The defendant has presented no points of law or fact that this court has overlooked or misapprehended; the defendant merely disagrees with this court’s exercise of discretion.

6. The Supreme Court has granted this court the discretion to hold any further proceedings it deems necessary to resolve the issue before it, and this court has already made clear that it deems an evidentiary hearing necessary. The defendant has presented no points of fact or law that this court has overlooked or misapprehended. The defendant’s motion should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

By its attorneys,

JOHN M. FORMELLA  
Attorney General

Date: March 30, 2026

/s/ Joshua L. Speicher  
Joshua L. Speicher, NH Bar #273020  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
N.H. Department of Justice  
One Granite Place, South  
Concord, NH 03301  
(603) 271-3671

/s/ Ryan N. Olberding  
Ryan N. Olberding, NH Bar #276552  
Assistant Attorney General  
N.H. Department of Justice  
One Granite Place, South  
Concord, NH 03301  
(603) 271-3671

/s/ Meghan C. Hagaman  
Meghan C. Hagaman, NH Bar #20804  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
N.H. Department of Justice  
One Granite Place, South  
Concord, NH 03301  
(603) 271-3671

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Joshua Speicher, do hereby certify that a copy of this pleading was provided to counsel of record on the date listed above via the court's electronic filing system.

/s/ Joshua L. Speicher  
Joshua L. Speicher