





**STATE OF COLORADO**  
**18<sup>TH</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER F. MICHAELSON**

Arapahoe County Justice Center

7325 S. Potomac St., Div 21

Centennial, CO 80112

Chief Justice Brian Boatright  
2 East 14th Avenue  
Denver, CO 80203

RE: A Matter of Statewide Concern – Domestic Relations Advocacy

To the Honorable Chief Justice:

Having completed almost four years in a dedicated domestic relations docket I understand how this type of caseload exhausts many good judges and affects how the public perceive the judiciary. While there are many consummate professionals in this field, too many seem to misunderstand the law and the rules which are uniquely crafted for this type of non-adversarial litigation.

I think it is important to note at the outset that I shared the genesis of this letter and solicited comments from every Colorado district court judicial officer. In response I received comments from almost two dozen judges and magistrates from thirteen judicial districts reaching every part of the state. Without exception every judicial officer shared my concerns leading me to believe the issues raised in this letter are of importance statewide and are of the nature which create obligations pursuant to Colorado Code Of Judicial Conduct, Rule 1.2 [Comment 4] and, Rule 2.5 [Comment 4]. Accordingly, in furtherance of that obligation I ask the Supreme Court rules committee, the domestic relations bar, the Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel, and other stakeholders to collaborate and take the necessary steps to improve the practice of domestic relations law in the state of Colorado.

My concerns are not undocumented or unnoticed already: three of the five disciplinary case summaries published in the *Colorado Lawyer* - December 2020 - and one out of three in the January 2021 *issue* - involved lawyers in domestic relations cases. This is no surprise: as required by Code of Jud. Conduct, Rule 2.15(B), I, and many other judges who responded to me, have had to regularly refer domestic relations attorneys to regulatory counsel. But, reporting disciplinary action one lawyer at a time appears not to be effective. Too often, the burden falls on the trial courts to be the *de facto* attorney regulation.

A judge wrote "I repeatedly refer counsel to Comment 2, in Rule of Prof Cond 2.1 which states that "[i]n a matter involving the allocation of parental rights and responsibilities, a lawyer should consider advising the client that parental conflict can have a significant adverse effect on minor children when I am of the opinion that lawyers are enabling conflict between parents. Personally, I think the language in the comment should be stronger and should require attorneys to provide this advice to clients so that clients can be aware of the long-term damage their conflict might cause their children. This not just common sense but is backed by social science research and should be taken seriously."

Another judge stated, "I too often reminded counsel of their obligations under the Rules of Professional Conduct and even lectured lawyers in front of their clients when it seemed apparent that the clients had no idea the level of fighting going on among counsel (i.e. costing them money)." A judge from the western slope remarked "I ... have had repeated unprofessional behavior with one ... attorney in particular. She has one public disciplinary case and many others that were referred to ARC but nothing of note occurred. The purpose of DR cases is (I thought) to encourage amicable resolutions and effective co-parenting. I too often see fuel added to the fire."

Among many efforts to resolve some of these problems I, like many of my colleagues, have issued orders to try and regulate the conduct of counsel in these kinds of cases. Yet, all too often abused spouses, struggling parents, and innocent children are required to participate in aggressive litigation despite the clear instruction in Rule 16.2 that the rules for domestic relations cases are designed to reduce "the negative impact of adversarial litigation wherever possible," a statement consistent with the legislative intent in Title 14 that it is in the best interest of the parties and their children "to be able to resolve disputes ... in an amicable and fair manner."

Many judges responded to my solicitation for comments and shared a concern that litigation in domestic relations cases is driven by attorney's fees, not dispute resolution. Several expressed concern that despite Rule 16.2(g) limitations on experts many attorneys hire experts in violation of the rule – driving up costs yet again. One noted "I have had many cases set for an ISC where attorneys simply do not appear and have not requested a continuance. I have cases where I have expressed my concern that the attorneys bicker more than the parties. I have seen many cases where the cost of attorney fees is unusually outrageous, which I blame on a lack of interest in trying to settle by the attorneys because they know at least one party has substantial funds to pay the fees. I have had many cases where one party refuses to disclose financial information, or at least substantially delays disclosure, which requires unnecessary intervention by the Court. I also have many attorneys assert they conferred, which turns out to be an email they sent, for which no response was received."

Another commented: "I am in my 25th year on the bench ... I can honestly state that the current status of the domestic practice is more contentious and less professional than I have ever seen it these many years ... [M]any of the domestic attorneys are simply not settling any cases and litigate everything. Contrary to the stated purpose of 16.2 in reducing the negative impact of adversarial litigation, the actions of many members of the DR bar serve to increase the conflict between the parties and to keep the battle going at all costs. By way of example, it is not unusual for me to have attorney fees of \$50,000.00+ per side on cases where the marital estate will be totally consumed by such fees. The good attorneys, the ones that we respect, will continue to settle cases and to reduce litigation and conflict. It is simply that more and more domestic attorneys do not aspire to the standards of professionalism that should be followed. This makes our duties as judges that much more challenging as we struggle to handle our ever-increasing dockets."

In furtherance then of trying to at least start a dialogue to think more deeply about these concerns, I hope you will consider the following suggestions endorsed by District Court Judges from all over the state:

1. Require a practice area CLE and, or, special certification by exam or other related criteria of lawyers who practice domestic relations, and or certification that the lawyer has obtained and agrees to maintain malpractice insurance covering this area of the practice of law.

2. A requirement that litigants in domestic relations cases be provided by counsel, who shall file a certificate of compliance signed by both the attorneys and their clients (under possible sanctions allowed by C.R.C.P. Rule 11 and 107) that the attorneys have reviewed, in detail with their client an advisement as follows (citations omitted):

The purpose of Rule 16.2 and Title 14 which govern domestic relations cases is to reduce "the negative impact of adversarial litigation wherever possible", "promote the amicable settlement of disputes" and "mitigate the potential harm to the spouses and their children". Accordingly, spouses must accept dissolution proceeds in as "civil and decent a manner as possible".

The Court recognizes that these types of proceedings can be emotional, stressful and antagonistic especially when issues involve children. In order to avoid causing damage to your children if they are involved in this case the parties are encouraged to review the Adverse Childhood Experience (A.C.E.) [www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/acestudy](http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/acestudy). Further, for younger children, divorce or separation can be confusing and for parents, being able to answer questions from your child about the divorce or separation can be difficult. Sesame Street has available a "Divorce Toolkit" with books, songs and videos that can help parents answer, in a constructive way, these questions. See [www.sesamestreet.org/toolkits/divorce](http://www.sesamestreet.org/toolkits/divorce). The Court also recognizes that co-parenting is often a challenge but there are resources to help parents such as [www.uptoparents.org](http://www.uptoparents.org) ; online programs or mobile apps that can help with communications including [www.2houses.com](http://www.2houses.com) (\$10 per month), [www.ourfamilywizard.com](http://www.ourfamilywizard.com) (\$99 per parent per year) and [www.talkingparents.com](http://www.talkingparents.com) (free) among others; and information about developing a parenting plan. See: [www.azcourts.gov/portals/31/parentingtime/ppwguidelines.pdf](http://www.azcourts.gov/portals/31/parentingtime/ppwguidelines.pdf).

The Court encourages parties to explore these and similar resources extensively as they seek to resolve this dispute as cooperatively as possible. The terms which follow set forth the Court's general policies concerning how it will resolve disputes in the event the parties cannot do so.

Pursuant to C.R.S., 14-10-102 the court has broad discretionary powers to grant temporary orders to mitigate potential harm to spouses and their children caused by the process of legal dissolution of marriage by maintaining the status quo pending the final resolution of the proceeding.

Pursuant to C.R.C.P. Rule 16.2(e)(1) the parties owe each other a fiduciary duty of full and honest disclosures "of all facts that materially affect their rights and interests and those of the children involved in the case... without awaiting inquiry from the other party." Unless a party obtains a protective order pursuant to C.R.C.P. Rule 16.2(f)(6) and (7), Rule 26(b)(5) relating to privilege, and Rules 26(c) full and voluntary disclosure is required of all material information. Information is "material" if it has "some logical connection with the consequential facts" and is "more than merely probative or relevant evidence."

3. Amend C.R.S. 14-10-107 and 108 to include the following:

The parties shall continue to allow the parenting time afforded each immediately prior to the filing of the Petition in this case. If a party believes a child is endangered by the exercise of the other parent's parenting time a motion pursuant to C.R.S. 14-10-129(4) may be filed. Frivolous or groundless motions may result in the imposition of attorney's fees pursuant to C.R.S. 14-10-129(5); and,

All parties are required to make payments for mortgage or rent, insurance, utilities or related services, transportation, medical care, or child-care or any other expense related to the marital estate, including but not limited to ordinary expenses incurred by, or on behalf of the other party and any minor child for whom support was being provided, in the same manner and amount as the party had paid at the time of separation or the filing of the petition, whichever date is earlier.

4. Amend C.R.S. 14-10-108 and C.R.C.P. Rule 16.2 (c)(3)(C) to expressly state that the Court can issue temporary orders *sua sponte*.
5. Amend Rule 16.2(e)(2), (5) and (6) (and Forms 35.1, 35.2 and 35.3) to require that the forms are fully completed, including at a minimum an estimate of income, expenses, and property value.
6. Amend Rule 16.2(c)(30)(C) to clarify that all motions shall include the certificate of conferral required by C.R.C.P. Rule 121, 1-15(8) and must describe meaningful efforts to "converse, confer, compare views, consult and deliberate" prior to filing the motion.
7. Amend Rule 16.2(c)(4) to add a subsection (C) which states "Motions, unless otherwise ordered by the Court, shall require a timely response and reply, comply with the length requirements of C.R.C.P. Rule 121, 1-15(1) and contain legal authority as required by C.R.C.P. Rule 121, 1-15(3)."
8. Require conferral certificates to state that counsel provided a copy of any filing to their client.
9. Revise the JDF forms to state the C.R.C.P. Rule 121, 1-1(8) conferral requirement and that it applies to all parties, including *pro se*.
10. C.R.C.P. Rule 16.2 needs to make clear that responses to the petitions and motions allowed by Title 14 should not use the Rule 8 civil "admissions and denial" of each "allegation."
11. Efforts must be made, and if necessary, higher pay to incentivize, more professionals to become Child and Family Investigators.
12. Amend C.R.C.P. Rule 16.2 to include proportionality requirements as set forth already in civil cases by C.R.C.P. Rule 16 including a certification that the parties have discussed the cost of litigating an issue compared to the value of the issue in dispute, signed by the client including a specific advisement to clients that they have the right to direct the services of their attorney, limit expenditures and the parties may reach a joint agreement regarding how much of their marital estate they are going to spend on attorney fees.



13. Amend C.R.C.P. Rule 16.2(g) to provide for striking the expert or other sanctions if the offering party has not complied with the rule.

Perhaps, it may be necessary to create refer these concerns to a committee. I do not expect results will occur overnight, or without great effort by all the stake-holders. I hope that the many excellent lawyers in this practice area – many who mentioned to me their similar frustrations - will be willing to with the judiciary as well.

In any event, I thank you in advance for your time and consideration of these issues.

Respectfully,



---

District Court Judge Peter F. Michaelson

cc: Family Law Section Executive Council  
Jessica E. Yates, Attorney Regulation Counsel  
District Court Judges and Magistrates

## FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF COLORADO

EL PASO COUNTY JUDICIAL COMPLEX

270 S. Tejon

Colorado Springs, Colorado 80901

David S. Prince  
DISTRICT JUDGE  
david.prince@judicial.state.co.us

March 9, 2021

Ezra Hurwitz, Esq.  
Knies, Helland & McPherson  
1122 North El Paso Street  
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Dear Mr. Hurwitz:

I write to you in your role as the domestic relations section chair of the El Paso County Bar Association. I am prompted to write because I understand a letter from a judicial colleague in another district is now circulating among domestic relations lawyers. I understand the letter addresses concerns that purport to be widely held by judicial officers about the ethics and quality of domestic relations attorneys. I write to offer a different perspective, a perspective that I present solely as my own.

I am one of those judges that came to a domestic relations docket assignment without any prior experience with domestic relations law or practice. I was certainly disappointed to hear of the disheartening experiences my colleague from another district endured. However, my experience could not have been more different in the Fourth Judicial District. I found the local domestic relations bar extremely welcoming and supportive of my learning domestic relations. I have also found them to be dedicated to a remarkably high standard of professionalism in their conduct.

I had the good fortune to receive the assignment to domestic relations at about the same time that the local bar was hosting a series of programs aimed at new domestic relations practitioners. I attended the classes, held conveniently at the courthouse. The programs were, of course, substantively quite helpful to me. However, what struck me most was (1) the level of participation by senior and highly visible members of the domestic bar and (2) the constant, explicit emphasis on professionalism by each presenter. I experienced what was clearly a conscious effort to value and perpetuate a dedication to a culture of professionalism. Each senior member of this legal community made a point of discussing the importance of professional relations in nearly every discussion. I was impressed but, as a cynical outsider, wondered if this constant refrain was a sign of an existing strength to be preserved or a recognition of a shortcoming in need of remedy. My experience in the docket itself would answer that question quickly enough.

I came to the domestic relations docket with a less than positive outlook, having heard all my life about the ugliness of “divorce lawyers.” However, what I found could not have been more different than those popular culture stories had led me to expect. I found consummate professionals highly focused on integrity. I found a group of professionals that regularly “swap sides” in these cases so that one does not see the institutional zeal for a particular point of view in a case that one sometimes sees in other dockets. I also saw professionals that handle large numbers of cases with large numbers of court appearances so that they are constantly crossing paths with each other. The result I experienced was lawyers taking care not to treat a colleague unprofessionally, knowing they would face that same lawyer, possibly from a position of weakness, in the near future.

I was also impressed with the awareness among these lawyers of the incredibly high personal stakes of a domestic relations case. Of course, I am not talking about money here. I am talking about the intimate and deeply personal nature of the issues in a domestic relations case and the trauma of a process that turns these most delicate of issues out on a table for intrusive public examination. I also speak of the risks of the children whose future emotional health is at stake in not just the substantive issues in these cases, but the impacts on them of the *manner* in which these disputes are handled. A lawyer that lacks perspective in this field runs a high risk of “destroying the village in order to save the village.” And, of course, society pays the price as well when that child’s future emotional health is unnecessarily trampled. From the beginning, I have marveled at the deftness with which I constantly see domestic relations lawyers strike that balance of aggressive advocacy for their client’s goals with an approach designed to minimize the “collateral damage” to that family for the future. I cannot express how impressed I have been with the skills brought to that impossible tasks by our local domestic relations professionals.

When my inexperience led me to make inevitable mistakes in starting this docket, I was also impressed with the firm but diplomatic way in which individual lawyers or the domestic relations legal community moved to enlighten me. I remember vividly a senior member of the domestic bar taking me aside one early day to let me know I was pursuing a problematic practice. While settled in the belief of the wisdom of my own practices, I was soon persuaded that my practice that worked so well in other case types carried difficulties that I had failed to appreciate in this docket. After the discussion, I began to consider the impressive level of cohesiveness among the legal community, level of trust, and level of courage that had gone into arranging for that gentle guidance to a new judicial officer. I am also aware that the local community has used similar means to help their colleagues as they may encounter challenges of various forms. I could not but admire such a community of professionals.

I was originally given a three year rotation in domestic relations cases. My term was extended to more than four years with my consent. Given the way we handle docket assignments in this district, I was not likely to be asked to accept another rotation in a domestic relations docket. However, after one year away, I asked for a second assignment to the domestic relations docket. I was delighted when my request was granted. While I lose track of the years, I believe I have had a domestic relations docket for just over seven years now. My early impressions of our domestic relations lawyers as consummate professionals strongly committed



to a culture of mutually respectful treatment and high community ethics has not waived or dimmed in that time.

I have, of course, encountered poor decisions by lawyers in individual cases (and I have made my own poor decisions at times). Again, we may benefit from the frequency of court appearances in this district. I say this because I can only think of a few questionable conduct decisions of domestic relations lawyers and for most of them, they were lawyers I've seen in many cases so that I can better understand how out of character the apparent misstep was. That context also helps me understand that a judge does not always know the full context of a decision by counsel and that sometimes what appears to be a misstep on the surface has good reason behind it.

During my judicial career, I have been required to contemplate involvement of the Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel ("OARC") for an ethical transgression by a lawyer in a case. These have been very rare in my experience over the last 15 years. Thinking back, I cannot recall a single instance in which I have had to turn to OARC in a domestic relations case. I cannot even recall a single instance in a domestic relations case in which I seriously contemplated such an action.

Reading my colleague's letter brings several thoughts to mind. First, as I communicated to him when he circulated a draft, reviewing his letter was saddening for the difficulties he has had to endure but, at the same time, it was heartening to me and made me appreciate all the more the strengths of the domestic relations professionals I have had the luxury to have in my court. I also cautioned my colleague against projecting isolated experiences from one or a small number of courtrooms to a statewide problem. I suppose I need to take my own caution and not project the excellent experiences I have had in my courtroom to the rest of the state. However, my limited contact with the statewide domestic relations bar has been fully consistent with the local domestic relations bar here in the Fourth.

Another important realization I had was that we often see discussion of shortcomings. We rarely see discussions of what works properly—you know the old saw that we never see a headline telling us that so many thousand airplanes landed safely today. I was a little embarrassed to realize as I read my colleague's letter about his unfortunate encounters with poor lawyering that I was dishonoring the professionals with which I have worked by failing to communicate my good fortune to have encountered them. I was also embarrassed to realize that I have not adequately thanked those professionals that have made my time in a domestic relations docket so rewarding. Hence this letter. Whether you have actually appeared in my court or have been one of the many lawyers that have helped create and maintain the superb legal culture we enjoy locally, thank you.

There is also an important caution to take from my colleague's letter as well as an insight from the trainings I attended back in 2012, one cannot take for granted a positive characteristic of one's culture. Without dedicated attention, you risk its loss. The senior members of the domestic relations bar that I saw in those trainings clearly cherished the professionalism that existed in our local domestic relations legal community. Equally obvious was that they had

realized they must consciously nurture that valued aspect of the community, take the time to pursue a studied approach to promoting it, resist the urge to depart from it when convenient, devote the resources to perpetuate it with new members, and hold peers to its demands gently but firmly.

I hope my colleague's letter will not discourage members of our local domestic relations community but will, as it did for me, hearten you with our good fortune to have a different experience. I hope it will also energize all of us to preserve and improve upon the strong culture of professionalism passed down to us by the lawyers that have preceded us.

I defer to you, Mr. Hurwitz, whether or how to share these thoughts with others.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Prince', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

David S. Prince



Steven C. Lass ■ Marie Avery Moses ■ Jeremy M. Ramp ■ Patricia A. Cooper  
Katharine Elena Lum ■ MariaJose Delgado

May 7, 2021

Chief Justice Brian Boatright  
2 East 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80203

Judge Peter Michaelson  
7325 S. Potomac St, Div 21  
Centennial, Colorado 80112

Re: Domestic Relations Advocacy

To the Honorable Chief Justice and Judge Michaelson,

Thank you, Judge Michaelson, for your letter re “A Matter of Statewide Concern – Domestic Relations Advocacy.” I write to you as the current Chair of the Family Law Section.

The domestic relations bar, and especially the Executive Council of the Family Law Section, has spent significant time processing and discussing the letter and the issues raised in it, including at our March and April Executive Council meetings. While many were put off by the tone of the letter and decision to measure the whole lot by the most problematic attorneys amongst us, many practitioners shared the frustration and disappointment in the system and the people who make up that system. Many pointed out that there are unprofessional and difficult lawyers in civil and criminal as well, not just domestic relations. Many expressed frustration with new judges with no experience in family law being assigned to a domestic relations docket to learn how to be a judge while taking on the difficult task of learning a new substantive area of law. Many questioned whether a response was warranted at all, or whether a response would further entrench an “us versus them” mentality.

We were encouraged by hearing from other judicial officers who offered differing perspectives, opinions and support for family law practitioners coupled with recognition of the difficult work we do under difficult circumstances—and recognition that family law is different than civil or criminal law. One of the consistent themes that kept coming up from

May 7, 2021

Page 2

our members was that we see the bench and bar in partnership with a common goal, which is to improve the system of justice for the parties and children impacted by family law cases. We see Judge Michaelson's letter as an opportunity and a springboard to work with the judiciary to make the system work better for judges, lawyers, litigants and the children involved. We believe that the system can only be improved by the bench and bar working together, rather than being adversaries in an already adversarial system. Our desire is to work with the judiciary to strengthen that partnership in furtherance of our common goal of improving the access and quality of justice for those in the family law system.

Judges with domestic dockets see the most difficult and contentious cases day-in and day-out. The judiciary's exposure to the best work we do, which is getting the vast majority of our cases resolved by agreement and without the need for court intervention, is limited. While there are unquestionably exceptions, every good family law practitioner works very hard to settle cases and keep families out of court—and statistically, we are very successful at this. The cases that go to trial often deal with the most difficult legal and factual issues involving children and finances. The cases that go to trial often involve individuals who for one reason or another—e.g., fear, anger, substance abuse, mental health issues, etc.—cannot or will not reach resolution by negotiation and compromise. Judges often do not have visibility into the intense work that domestic relations practitioners dedicate to settling an equal number of high conflict cases involving similarly challenging clients. Seeing nothing but the most difficult high conflict cases certainly takes a toll on our judges who do the important work of presiding over domestic cases. We acknowledge and appreciate the work and professionalism demonstrated by the vast majority of judges the vast majority of the time.

Rather than attempting to respond point-by-point to the issues and ideas raised in Judge Michaelson's letter, we believe it far more productive to make our leaders and members available to meet and discuss with the judiciary different methods of approaching and solving these issues. One of the common points raised by our membership in the course of these discussions was the call for a dedicated family court system, with judges trained and experienced in domestic relations, and judges who want to have a domestic relations docket. Judge Michaelson's letter has resurrected discussions regarding the September 2009 report from our predecessors on the Family Court Task Force who studied and made recommendations about different steps that could improve the practice, and I am attaching a copy of the summary of that report to this letter.

I can tell you that we are equally interested in raising the level of education and professionalism amongst our bar, while facing the frustrating and common issue that those practitioners who need the education and professionalism lessons the most, often are not the ones who show up. We are committed to open communication between the bench and the bar, and we are always open to feedback about what we are doing that is working, and more importantly, what we are doing that is not working.

May 7, 2021  
Page 3

Family law lawyers are accustomed to facing very difficult problems and finding solutions, and we are committed to working with the bench on these issues to find means of improving the practice of family law and all those that are impacted by it. We need and welcome the bench's support, wisdom and partnership, and we look forward to working with you on our common goal of improving the practice of family law in Colorado. We thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jer Ramp", with a stylized, cursive script.

Jeremy Ramp  
email: [jramp@familylaw5280.com](mailto:jramp@familylaw5280.com)

JR/Enclosure



## Jeremy Ramp

---

**From:** michaelson, peter <peter.michaelson@judicial.state.co.us>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 7, 2021 3:57 PM  
**To:** Jeremy Ramp  
**Cc:** Jamie Cage; lla@adlawcolorado.com; Wozniak, Diane E.; Kate Lewis; bonnie@bonnieschriner.com; Jessica Yates; District Judges; Magistrates  
**Subject:** RE: A Matter of Statewide Concern – Domestic Relations Advocacy

This is an excellent response to the issues I raised in my letter and I really appreciate receiving it. I wholeheartedly endorse a family law court which I know has been discussed for many years, and I think tried at one time in Arapahoe County. Thank you for your attention to these issues. I wish you and the other professionals committed to the practice of family law good luck in your future efforts to improve how the public receives services from counsel and the courts.

Peter F. Michaelson  
District Court Judge, Div. 21  
18th Judicial District  
Arapahoe County Justice Center  
7325 S. Potomac Street  
Centennial, CO 80112-4030



**From:** Jeremy Ramp <jramp@familylaw5280.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 7, 2021 3:35 PM  
**To:** michaelson, peter <peter.michaelson@judicial.state.co.us>; Chief Justice Brian Boatright <ChiefJustice@judicial.state.co.us>  
**Cc:** Jamie Cage <jamie@cagebucarlewis.com>; lla@adlawcolorado.com; Wozniak, Diane E. <dwozniak@shermanhoward.com>; Kate Lewis <kate@cagebucarlewis.com>; bonnie@bonnieschriner.com; Jessica Yates <j.yates@csc.state.co.us>; District Judges <districtjudges@judicial.state.co.us>; Magistrates <magistrates@judicial.state.co.us>  
**Subject:** RE: A Matter of Statewide Concern – Domestic Relations Advocacy

Good afternoon,  
Please see attached letter with attachment. Thank you.

Jeremy

**Jeremy Ramp**  
Attorney



## Jerremy Ramp

---

**From:** mccallin, andrew <andrew.mccallin@judicial.state.co.us>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 9, 2021 12:09 PM  
**To:** Jerremy Ramp  
**Subject:** Re: A Matter of Statewide Concern – Domestic Relations Advocacy

Hello Jerremy –

Thank you for this response. I think it's important for you and the bar to know that I did not support Judge Michaelson's letter. I disagree with many of the suggestions and views set forth in that letter.

That's not to say that there isn't work to do on both sides of the bench when it comes to improving the experience for the parties in our DR case. I look forward to working with you and the bar to make these improvements.

Take care and thanks for all of the work that you are doing on this effort,

*Andy*

Andrew P. McCallin  
(he/him/his)  
Denver District Judge  
Courtroom 466  
City & County Building  
1437 Bannock Street  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
(303) 606-2438  
[Andrew.McCallin@Judicial.State.CO.US](mailto:Andrew.McCallin@Judicial.State.CO.US)



**From:** Jerremy Ramp <jramp@familylaw5280.com>  
**Date:** Friday, May 7, 2021 at 3:36 PM  
**To:** michaelson, peter <peter.michaelson@judicial.state.co.us>, Chief Justice Brian Boatright <ChiefJustice@judicial.state.co.us>  
**Cc:** Jamie Cage <jamie@cagebucarlewis.com>, Ila@adlawcolorado.com <Ila@adlawcolorado.com>, Wozniak, Diane E. <dwozniak@shermanhoward.com>, Kate Lewis <kate@cagebucarlewis.com>, bonnie@bonnieschriner.com <bonnie@bonnieschriner.com>, Jessica Yates <j.yates@csc.state.co.us>, District Judges <districtjudges@judicial.state.co.us>, Magistrates <magistrates@judicial.state.co.us>  
**Subject:** RE: A Matter of Statewide Concern – Domestic Relations Advocacy

Good afternoon,  
Please see attached letter with attachment. Thank you.

Jerremy

## Jerremy Ramp

---

**From:** holbrook, sharon <sharon.holbrook@judicial.state.co.us>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 10, 2021 8:11 AM  
**To:** Jerremy Ramp  
**Subject:** RE: A Matter of Statewide Concern – Domestic Relations Advocacy

Mr. Ramp,

I just wanted to reach out and thank you, and the family law bar, for such a thoughtful response to Judge Michaelson's letter. Frankly, I did not sign on to the letter for the reasons that you outlined. Namely, that the majority of family law practitioners are nothing short of amazing for the work that they do, and also that a large part of the problem lies at our feet for how we have assigned new/untrained judges as well as judges who do not want to be in DR or JV, to such an important rotation. I have advocated for years for a "family court" rotation that includes domestic as well as juvenile, and would require specialized training as outlined in the NCFJCJ recommendations that first came out in 2005, and were updated in 2015 and 2019 [*link below: The Modern Family Court Judge: Knowledge, Qualities, and Skills for Success*]. I firmly believe that judges work best in subjects that they are passionate about, and that any area of law dealing with kids and families should be our first and highest priority. Having done rotations in all areas of law in my jurisdiction, I know that the better we do in domestic and juvenile, the better off our communities will be, and hopefully we will keep these children of conflict and trauma out of our criminal and civil divisions as adults.

All of this is to say thank you, and to let you know that I am on board, in whatever capacity would be helpful, to assist in your advocacy and campaign for change.

Best,  
Sharon Holbrook

<https://www.ncjfcj.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/endorsement-of-the-modern-court-judge-knowledge-qualities-and-skills-for-success.pdf>

Hon. Sharon D. Holbrook  
Pronouns: she, her, hers  
District Court Judge  
17<sup>th</sup> Judicial District

**From:** Jerremy Ramp <jramp@familylaw5280.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 7, 2021 3:35 PM  
**To:** michaelson, peter <peter.michaelson@judicial.state.co.us>; Chief Justice Brian Boatright <ChiefJustice@judicial.state.co.us>  
**Cc:** Jamie Cage <jamie@cagebucarlewis.com>; Ila@adlawcolorado.com; Wozniak, Diane E. <dwozniak@shermanhoward.com>; Kate Lewis <kate@cagebucarlewis.com>; bonnie@bonnieschriner.com; Jessica Yates <j.yates@csc.state.co.us>; District Judges <districtjudges@judicial.state.co.us>; Magistrates <magistrates@judicial.state.co.us>  
**Subject:** RE: A Matter of Statewide Concern – Domestic Relations Advocacy

Good afternoon,