

**AGENDA**  
**COLORADO SUPREME COURT**  
**RULES OF JUVENILE PROCEDURE COMMITTEE**

Friday, February 7, 2025, 9 a.m.  
Videoconference Meeting via Webex

- I. Call to Order
- II. Chair's Report
  - A. Minutes for December 6, 2024 Meeting [pages 2-7]
  - B. New D&N Rules Out for Comment
    - Deadline for Written Comments: March 31st at 4 p.m.
    - Deadline to Request to Speak at Hearing: March 31st at 4 p.m.
    - Hearing: April 9th at 3:30 p.m., Supreme Court Courtroom
    - Email comments/requests to speak: [supremecourtrules@judicial.state.co.us](mailto:supremecourtrules@judicial.state.co.us)
- III. New Business
  - A. Feedback & Updates to Rule 4.6 (disclosure and discovery) [pages 8-10]
  - B. Feedback & Updates to ICWA Rules
  - C. Truancy Rules
- IV. Old Business (NONE)
- V. Future Meetings: April 4<sup>th</sup> (Rockies Opening Day at 2:10 p.m.); June 6<sup>th</sup>; August 1<sup>st</sup>; October 3<sup>rd</sup>; December 5<sup>th</sup>.
- VI. Adjourn

**Colorado Supreme Court**  
**Colorado Rules of Juvenile Procedure Committee**  
**Draft Meeting Minutes: Friday, December 6, 2024**

**I. Call to Order**

A quorum being present, the Colorado Rules of Juvenile Procedure Committee was called to order by the Chair at around 9 a.m. via videoconference.

The following members were present at the meeting:

The Chair, Judge Craig R. Welling; David P. Ayraud; Jerin T. Damo; Traci Engdol-Fruhworth; Magistrate Randall Lococo; Judge Priscilla J. Loew; Judge Pax L. Moultrie; Angela Rose; Z Saroyan; Judge Theresa Slade; Anna Ulrich; Pamela Gorden Wakefield; and Abigail Young.

The following members were excused from the meeting:

Judge Karen A. Ashby (retired); Judge David Furman (retired); Judge Ann Meinster (retired); Professor Colene Robinson; and Lisa Shellenberger.

J.J. Wallace, a non-voting participant, was present at the meeting, and Justice Richard L. Gabriel and Terri Morrison, also non-voting participants, were excused.

Jennifer Mullenbach, a member of the Drafting Subcommittee, attended the meeting as a guest.

The following materials were used during the meeting:

1. Draft minutes of the 8/2/2024 meeting
2. Memo on C.R.J.P. 2.3 & 2.4
3. Draft Rules Proposal
4. Written Feedback

**II. Chair's Report**

**A. Minutes**

The minutes of the August 2, 2024 meeting were approved without amendment.

**B. Plan for Feedback on Rule 4.6**

The committee has received some feedback on the implementation of Rule 4.6. Rather than taking focus off the draft rules set, the committee will keep the feedback and, once

the draft rules are approved and submitted to the court, begin looking at the feedback for making updates to Rule 4.6.

The Chair also noted that the ICWA rules were a year old and may need some maintenance. A committee member also mentioned that Truancy lacks rules and the committee may want to consider modifying Rule 1 (Application) to include Truancy. The chair indicated that the committee can begin looking at these issues at the next meeting in February and come up with concrete plans to address them.

### **III. New Business**

#### **A. Drafting Subcommittee – Memo on C.R.J.P. 2.3 & 2.4**

The Chair explained that the Drafting Subcommittee recommended a couple more changes to the 2-series rules as outlined in the memo provided with the meeting materials. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the changes. No further feedback was offered. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **B. Draft Rules Proposal**

The Chair thanked the Drafting Subcommittee for their hard work and indicated that he would go through all the rules asking for feedback from the committee.

Rule 1: a member indicated that the committee should consider adding the School Attendance Law of 1963, article 33 of title 22 (Truancy), to applicability. Other members indicated that having a reference to Truancy would be helpful because it's "the Wild West" when it comes to rules in these case types. The committee felt that this was likely a good idea. The committee decided to discuss this issue further at the February meeting with the hopes of coming up with a plan to generate stakeholder input.

Rules 2 to 2.4: These rules were discussed at recent meetings. There were no further comments.

Rule 4.1: Added "brought" after cases to indicate that these rules apply to all D&N cases. Some provisions that apply to D&N cases are found in article 1 (not just article 3). Adding "brought" clarifies that the case is initially brought under article 3 and is consistent with language in other rules and statutes. (*see e.g.*, Rule 4.3 "A dependency and neglect case must be *brought* by a county attorney"; § 19-3-201, C.R.S. "all proceedings *brought* pursuant to this article 3").

Rule 4.2: No comments.

Rule 4.3: A member explained that the rule is clear that GALs are not parties because they are not listed.

A member asked about CASAs and learned that CASAs are covered by a separate rule (Rule 4.28).

Another member asked about the reference to “juvenile court.” Because section 19-1-103(89), C.R.S. (2024) defines “Juvenile court” or “court” as “the juvenile court of the city and county of Denver or the juvenile division of the district court outside of the city and county of Denver” and Rule 4.2 adopts the definitions in the Children’s Code, the Drafting Subcommittee decided to use, as a convention throughout the rules, “juvenile court” as the first reference to the court in a rule and subsequent references within the same rule as “court.”

Rule 4.4: A member reminded the committee that this rule was drafted by a subcommittee (the HB22-1038 Subcommittee) to incorporate new legislation clarifying children’s right to participate in the proceedings. Generally, the committee has not tried to impose new requirements with the rules. The goal has been to conform to legislative requirements and current practices. However, section (c) is a bit of a departure. Children participating in the proceedings has been a sea change and the committee felt that the inquiry requirement in (c) provides robust guidance to implement the change.

Rule 4.5: No comments.

Rule 4.6: No comments.

Rule 4.7: No comments.

Rule 4.8: Upon the suggestion of a member, the committee added a reference to where the definition of “Indian child” is found in the U.S. Code. The committee considered referring to the Children’s Code’s definitions statute, or the ICWA statute, but members felt that these can change or be renumbered and citing to the federal authority would be a better option. The committee also added a reference to the Colorado Rules of ICWA Procedures in the Comments.

Rule 4.9: The Drafting Subcommittee did not make sweeping changes to this rule because the Disclosure and Discovery Rule is still new. The committee has received some written feedback and will have the rule on the agenda for the February 2025 meeting.

Rule 4.10: The committee added “youth” to the title of the rule. As another convention, the Drafting Subcommittee used “Children” and “Youth” together.

Rule 4.11: At the suggestion of a member, the committee added the following comment: “Nothing in this rule limits the power of the court to appoint, for good cause, a respondent parent counsel, counsel for youth, or guardian ad litem prior to the filing of a petition” to the rule.

Rule 4.12: No comments.

Rule 4.13: No comments.

Rule 4.14: No comments.

Rule 4.15: One member asked whether there was an advisement for kids. The legislation does not require the court to advise kids. Advisements are left to the lawyers. The committee thought this made sense because it allows for advisements tailored to the individual’s needs.

Rule 4.16: No comments.

Rule 4.17: No comments.

Rule 4.18: No comments.

Rule 4.19: No comments.

Rule 4.20: No comments.

Rule 4.21: Members pointed out that subsections (b)(3) and (4) could be impacted by three cases currently before the supreme court on certiorari review.

Rule 4.22: No comments.

Rule 4.23: No comments.

Rule 4.24: Added “joint placement of siblings” to the list of hearing procedures and requirements in the comment.

Rule 4.25: No comments.

Rule 4.26: The Chair pointed out that the main thing this rule does is clarify that the statement of the youth's position should be treated the same as reports by the other parties for review hearings.

Rule 4.27: A small formatting change was made to un-bold a couple of sequential numbers/letters.

Rule 4.28: A member asked whether "by order of the court" could be deleted from the end of (a) as redundant to "appoint." The committee used the language to emphasize that a formal order helps CASAs do their job.

Rule 4.29: The committee focused its discussion on section (c) Re: Reports. Section (c) lays out a procedure to provide notice of social studies and other reports that are admissible by statute, *see* §§ 19-1-107 and 19-3-604(3). Committee members were hesitant to create a process around these reports. Members felt that there were no problems to solve in this area because admission of these reports (without the witness also being present) was a fairly rare occurrence, so it was best to let the statutes speak for themselves. By consensus, (c) in the proposal on Reports was deleted from the final draft and the reference to (c) in (b)(2) was also removed.

Rule 4.30: The rule adopts C.R.C.P. 121 section 1-15 with the listed alterations. A member thought leading with pre-trial motions was confusing, so the rule was reordered to start with responses, go to replies, and then talk about pretrial motions. The committee also modified the default response time from 7 days to 14 days. Committee members said that, although D&N cases move quickly, under contemporary practice norms, 14 days is a fair response time.

Rule 4.31: A formatting change was made to align (d) with (a), (b), and (c).

Rule 4.32: This is just the current rule (C.R.J.P. 4.4). No comments.

Rule 4.33: This is also the current rule (C.R.J.P. 4.5), but the committee agreed to remove the old comment explaining the reasons why the committee changed the number of days that a person must be personally served before the hearing from 20 days to 14 days.

Rule 4.34: The committee considered adding a reference to section 19-3-604(3) to the beginning of the rule ("Except for reports filed pursuant to section 19-1-107") but rejected the idea because there does not appear to be a problem with these reports.

Rule 4.35: No comments.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the draft as amended by the committee and to forward the draft to the supreme court with a recommendation for approval. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair extended his deepest gratitude to the committee for this years-long effort. Also, thanks to Judge Ashby, who began the process and has been involved since the beginning. And very special thanks to the Drafting Subcommittee, who met every two weeks for over a year to finalize the draft.

The Chair will draft a letter to the supreme court and forward the rules to the court for their consideration.

At the February meeting, the committee will look at Truancy and maintenance issues with the disclosure and discovery rule and the ICWA rules. If anyone has any feedback in the meantime, please email the Chair or J.J. Wallace.

#### **IV. Old Business (none)**

#### **V. Future Meetings**

The next meeting is February 7, 2025.

Additional meetings are scheduled for:

- April 4, 2025
- June 6, 2025
- August 1, 2025
- October 3, 2025
- December 5, 2025

#### **VI. Adjourn**

The committee meeting adjourned just before noon.

wallace, jennifer

---

**From:** David Ayraud [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 8, 2024 2:33 PM  
**To:** wallace, jennifer  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Question for Rules

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside of the Judicial Department. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

JJ - a question/issue came up today about the existing Discovery Rules and a request for a comment was made. Just as an example (which is what started the conversation), Rule 4.9(f)(1)(C) requires that handwritten notes, if any, must be disclosed.

The issue that was discussed is that most agencies, if a caseworker takes handwritten notes, they then input them into Trails or some other electronic format (they don't scan them).

The request is to add a comment that clarifies that any handwritten notes that are saved, preserved or otherwise memorialized in electronic or digital format, is the same as the original handwritten note.

This may be a question to raise or add to discussion with the full committee when we meet, but I wanted to get it out to you ahead of time.

Thanks,

David



**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This electronic transmission and any attached documents or other writings are intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is attorney privileged and confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify sender by return e-mail and destroy the communication. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action concerning the contents of this communication or any attachments by anyone other than the named recipient is strictly prohibited.

If you are a Larimer County employee or official, please do not disclose or forward this email outside of your department or office without first consulting with me or another attorney in the County Attorney's Office.



**wallace, jennifer**

---

**From:** Zaven Saroyan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2024 9:33 AM  
**To:** welling, craig; wallace, jennifer  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] For discussion - New Rule 4.6/9 (Discovery)

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside of the Judicial Department. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Judge Welling and J.J.,

Based on some information I am getting from the field, I wanted to suggest a slight modification to the new Rule 4.6/9 (Discovery) for discussion as previously discussed. Put simply, there appears to be some conflicts between the timeline for completing depositions (21 days before the hearing)(4.9(i)(3)) and the need to disclose witnesses/experts (7 days before the hearing)(4.9(g)).

The problem this is creating is the belief that disclosures do not need to be made early to allow for the deposition.

In the 4JD, Judge May has recommended adding to the CMO the following:

"If depositions are anticipated, a party may request a witness list be provided sooner than [seven] days prior to the contested [hearing]. If the parties are unable to reach an agreement on the request, the matter can be set for a status hearing with the court."

I think a change like this or perhaps other wording would be beneficial. In addition to the idea in general, we can of course discuss whether to change the rule itself or add a comment.

Best regards,

Z-

Zaven ("Z") Saroyan  
Appellate Director  
Office of Respondent Parents' Counsel  
1300 Broadway, Suite 340  
Denver, CO 80203  
[REDACTED]

**wallace, jennifer**

---

**From:** Zaven Saroyan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 9, 2024 1:57 PM  
**To:** wallace, jennifer; welling, craig  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Discovery Rule Discussion - Safety Assessments

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside of the Judicial Department. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Judge Welling and J.J.,

When we discussed the safety and risk assessments, it was considered that making those part of the "Automatic Disclosures" under subsection (e) of the Rule would be difficult because the assessments don't have to be completed for 14 days (if I remember the conversation correctly). Because of that, we placed it in "Disclosures on Written Request" under subsection (f).

However, in reviewing the Regs, I am not sure that is correct. Looking at 12 Colo. Code Regs. § 2509-2: 7.104(B) and 7.107.18, the two regs alone and in combination seem to require that at least the safety evaluation be completed before a child is removed. Additionally, it must be reviewed and approved by a supervisor within 24 hours of removal.

While the timeline for the risk assessment is longer (*see* 7.107.23-24 Colorado Family Risk Assessment Tool), it is very short for the safety assessment.

The assessment would be very valuable to both the court and counsel if it was available at or before the shelter hearing. I think it is worth discussing at the drafting committee meeting whether it makes sense to add safety assessments to automatic disclosures and to forward it to the main committee for review.

Best regards,

Z-

Zaven ("Z") Saroyan  
Appellate Director  
Office of Respondent Parents' Counsel  
1300 Broadway, Suite 340  
Denver, CO 80203  
[REDACTED]