9:00 a.m. EN BANC

2020SC595 (1 HOUR)

Petitioner:

Tung Chan Securities Commissioner for the State of Colorado.

V.

Respondents:

HEI Resources, Inc. f/k/a Heartland Energy, Inc.; Charles Reed Cagle; Brandon Davis; Heartland Energy Development Corporation; John Schiffner; and James Pollak.

For the Petitioner:

Janna K. Fischer Jodanna Lissette Haskins Robert William Finke OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

For the Respondents HEI Resources, Inc. f/k/a Heartland Energy, Inc. and Charles Reed Cagle:

Jeffrey Robert Thomas THOMAS LAW LLC

For the Respondents Heartland Energy Development Corporation and Brandon Davis:

Marcy Geoffrey Glenn
HOLLAND HART LLP
and
S. Wallace Dunwoody
Chase A. Cobern
Shain A. Khoshbin
MUNCK WILSON MANDALA LLP

For the Respondents John Schiffner and James Pollak:

Otto K. Hilbert LAW OFFICES OF OTTO K. HILBERT II

For Amicus Curiae National Federation of Independent Business

Teresa L. Ashmore ROBINSON WATERS ODORISIO PC

For Amicus Curiae North American Securities Administrators Assoc Inc

Theodore James Hartl
BALLARD SPAHR LLP
and
Kameron Hillstrom
NORTH AMERICAN SECURITIES
ADMINISTRATORS

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2018CA1769

Docketed: July 16, 2020 At Issue: October 12, 2021

ISSUE(S):

[REFRAMED] Whether the court of appeals erred by holding that Colorado should apply a 'strong presumption' that ageneral partnership is not a security.

Whether the court of appeals erred in its interpretation of the Williamson tests.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Oral Argument: Tuesday, December 7, 2021

Bailiff: Chambers of Justice Márquez

10:00 a.m. EN BANC

2021SC62 (1 HOUR)

In re the Marriage of

Petitioner:

Robert J. Mack,

and

Respondent:

Deborah B. Mack.

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2019CA1816

Docketed: January 27, 2021 At Issue: October 12, 2021 For the Petitioner:

Robert James Mack ROBERT J. MACK Pro Se

For the Respondent:

Daniel A. West BELTZ WEST P.C.

ISSUE(S):

[REFRAMED] Whether the court of appeals division below erred in concluding that a PERA member waived his argument that he had a right to remove his spouse as a cobeneficiary from his PERA retirement plan and to have the plan revert to a single life benefit option pursuant to section 24-51-802(3.8), C.R.S. (2020).

[REFRAMED] Whether the district court erred in denying a PERA member the right to remove a cobeneficiary spouse from his PERA retirement plan and in thereby preventing the plan's reversion to a single life benefit option pursuant to section 24 51 802(3.8), C.R.S. (2020).

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Oral Argument: Tuesday, December 7, 2021

Bailiff: Chambers of Justice Márquez

1:00 p.m. EN BANC

2021SA181 (1 HOUR)

Plaintiff-Appellant:

The People of the State of Colorado,

٧.

Defendant-Appellee:

Alfred Elias Moreno.

For the Plaintiff-Appellant:

Jefferson Jay Cheney Donald R. Nottingham PITKIN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

For the Defendant-Appellee:

Casey Mark Klekas
OFFICE OF THE STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER

Appeal from the District Court, 2019CR161

Docketed: June 4, 2021 At Issue: October 12, 2021

ISSUE(S):

Whether the trial court erred in finding that the Defendant proved, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the phrase "intent to harass" was unconstitutionally vague and overbroad, and thus, that section 18-9-111(1)(e), C.R.S. is unconstitutional

Colorado Supreme Court

Public Hearing - Tuesday, December 7, 2021 3:30 p.m.

Rules Governing Admission to the Practice of Law in Colorado - Rule 203.4

https://www.courts.state.co.us/Courts/Supreme_Court/Rule_Changes.cfm

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Oral Argument: Wednesday, December 8, 2021

Bailiff: Chambers of Justice Hood

9:00 a.m. EN BANC

2020SC852 (1 HOUR)

Petitioners:

Lodge Properties, Inc. and Board of Assessment Appeals,

٧.

Respondent:

Eagle County Board of Equalization.

For the Petitioner Lodge Properties, Inc.:

Julian Richard Ellis

BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK LLP and

Michael James Hofmann

Zachary Wood Fitzgerald

BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP

For the Petitioner Board of Assessment Appeals:

Evan P. Brennan

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

For the Respondent:

Bryan Robert Treu Christina Crosbie Hooper

EAGLE COUNTY ATTORNEYS OFFICE

and

Richard Frank Rodriguez

Donald M. Ostrander

Steven Louis-Prescott

HAMRE RODRIQUEZ OSTRANDER DINGESS

and

Ruthanne Hundley Goff

M Patrick Wilson

HOFFMANN PARKER WILSON CARBERRY PC

and

Joel M Spector

SPECTOR LAW LLC

For Amicus Curiae Colorado Counties Inc

Andrew David Ringel Ethan Elliott Zweig HALL & EVANS LLC

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2019CA266

Docketed: October 29, 2020 At Issue: October 12, 2021

ISSUE(S):

REFRAMED] Whether the court of appeals erred by holding that a hotel's contractual right to net rental incomegenerated from separately owned, but physically integrated, condominium units is not intangible personal property thatmust be excluded under section 39-3-118, C.R.S. from the actual value of the hotel under the income approach tovaluation in section 39-I-103(5)(a), C.R.S.

Whether the court of appeals erred by holding, for the first time, that the net income generated from rentals of individually and separately owned condominium units to guests of a hotel should be included in the actual value of the hotel under the income approach to valuation.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Oral Argument: Wednesday, December 8, 2021

Bailiff: Chambers of Justice Hood

10:00 a.m. EN BANC

2021SC245 (1 HOUR)

Petitioner:

The People of the State of Colorado,

In the Interest of Minor Children:

My. K.M., Child and Ma. K.M., Child,

٧.

Respondents:

V. K. L. and T. A. M..

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2020CA695

Docketed: April 8, 2021 At Issue: October 12, 2021 For the Petitioner:

Cathleen Marie Giovannini
DENVER CITY ATTORNEYS OFFICE

For the Respondent V. K. L.:

Joel M. Pratt

THE LAW OFFICE OF DAILEY PRATT

For the Respondent T. A. M.:

Patrick R. Henson HENSON LAW LLC

For Amicus Curiae Colorado Office of Respondent Parents Counsel

Zaven Taylor Saroyan THE SAROYAN LAW FIRM, L.L.C.

ISSUE(S):

[REFRAMED] Whether the Court of Appeals erred in its analysis of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) in determining Department of Human Services ('DHS') did not make 'active efforts' to provide services and programs designed to remediate the problems that caused DHS' involvement, rehabilitate parents, and prevent the breakup of the Indian family.