9:00 a.m. EN BANC

2011SC664 (1 HOUR)

Petitioner:

The People of the State of Colorado,

٧.

Respondent:

Jason LaRosa.

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2010CA926

Docketed: September 14, 2011

At Issue: May 4, 2012

For the Petitioner The People of the State of Colorado:

Paul Edward Koehler, First Assistant Attorney General OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

For the Respondent Jason LaRosa:

Forrest Wayne Lewis FORREST W LEWIS PC

ISSUE(S):

Whether the court of appeals erred when it reversed a conviction based on the corpus delicti doctrine, which prevents convicting a defendant based on his uncorroborated confession alone.

10:00 a.m. EN BANC

2011SC264 (30 MINUTES)

Petitioner:

Yanick Kazadi,

٧.

Respondent:

The People of the State of Colorado.

For the Petitioner Yanick Kazadi:

Antony Mark Noble THE NOBLE LAW FIRM, LLC

For the Respondent The People of the State of Colorado:

Emmy Ashmus Langley, Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General

For Amicus Curiae American Immigration Lawyers Association of Colorado

Aaron Clarke Hall JOSEPH LAW FIRM, P.C. and Emily Assunta White STERN & CURRAY LLC

For Amicus Curiae Colorado Criminal Defense Bar

Hans Christopher Meyer LAW OFFICE OF HANS MEYER, PC and Violeta Raquel Chapin UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO LAW SCHOOL,

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2009CA2640

Docketed: April 18, 2011 At Issue: May 21, 2012

ISSUE(S):

Whether a criminal defendant has the right to apply for post-conviction review of a deferred judgment pursuant to section 18-1-410, C.R.S. (2010) and Crim. P. 35(c).

10:30 a.m. EN BANC

2010SC762 (1 HOUR)

Petitioner:

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in its capacity as Receiver,

٧.

Respondent:

Yale Fisher.

For the Petitioner The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in its capacity as Receiver:

Steven Reeves Rider
Jeffery O McAnallen
James T Markus
Devi Colene Yorty
MARKUS WILLIAMS YOUNG & ZIMMERMANN

For the Respondent Yale Fisher:

Bennett L Cohen Philip W Bledsoe POLSINELLI SHUGHART, PC

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2009CA162

Docketed: November 8, 2010

At Issue: July 25, 2011

ISSUE(S):

Whether the court of appeals erred in holding that section 38-10-124(2), C.R.S. (2010), allowed the introduction of extrinsic evidence to interpret an allegedly ambiguous contract.

1:30 p.m. EN BANC

2010SC688 (1 HOUR)

Petitioner:

Atlantic Richfield Company,

٧.

Respondent:

Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation, f/k/a Equity Oil Company.

For the Petitioner Atlantic Richfield Company:

Elizabeth Titus Shannon Wells Stevenson DAVIS GRAHAM & STUBBS LLP

For the Respondent Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation, f/k/a Equity Oil Company:

Keith D Tooley Kathryn Haight WELBORN SULLIVAN MECK TOOLEY, P.C.

For Amicus Curiae The Colorado Bar Association

James William Bain BENJAMIN BAIN & HOWARD, LLC and Daniel A Sweetser SWEETSER LAW FIRM PC

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2009CA1081

Docketed: October 12, 2010 At Issue: March 16, 2012

ISSUE(S):

Whether the reformation provision is unconstitutionally retrospective, where such reformation deprives a party of its vested interest in real property.

Whether the Statutory Rule against Perpetuities Act's reformation provision, section 15-11-1106(2), C.R.S. (2009), authorizes a court to reform a nondonative, commercial option created prior to the effective date of the Act in order to bring it into compliance with the common law rule against perpetuities.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Oral Argument: Wednesday, October 3, 2012

Bailiff: Justice Hobbs' Chambers

8:45 a.m. EN BANC

Golden High School, Golden, CO

2011SC382 (1 HOUR)

Petitioner:

Walter James Tate,

٧.

Respondent:

The People of the State of Colorado.

Certiorari to the District Court, Arapahoe County, 2009CV2334

Docketed: June 3, 2011 At Issue: May 18, 2012 For the Petitioner Walter James Tate:

Nicholas J. Sarwark
COLORADO STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER

For the Respondent The People of the State of Colorado:

L. Andrew Cooper, Assistant District Attorney 18TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT ATTORNEY

ISSUE(S):

Whether the district court erred in finding that there was reasonable suspicion for an officer to contact the petitioner based on observing a parked vehicle, with the engine running and a man apparently asleep at the wheel.

Whether the district court erred in finding that a person must be conscious and awake to be seized under the Fourth Amendment.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Oral Argument: Wednesday, October 3, 2012

Bailiff: Justice Hobbs' Chambers

10:00 a.m. EN BANC

Golden High School, Golden, CO

2011SC529 (1 HOUR)

Petitioners:

L. A. N. a/k/a L.A.C. by and through her Guardian ad Litem and The People of the State of Colorado,

In the Interest of Minor Child:

L. A. N. a/k/a L.A.C.,

٧.

Respondent:

L. M. B..

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2010CA2408

Docketed: July 27, 2011 At Issue: May 21, 2012 For the Petitioner L. A. N. a/k/a L.A.C. by and through her Guardian ad Litem:

Amy J Packer PACKER LAW FIRM, LLC

For the Petitioner The People of the State of Colorado:

Laura Grzetic Eibsen, Assistant City Attorney DENVER CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

For the Respondent L. M. B.:

Susan Patricia Halloran and Kerry Elizabeth Simpson PICKARD & ASSOCIATES

For Amicus Curiae Office of the Chiild's Representative

Sheri Danz

ISSUE(S):

Whether the court of appeals erred in determining that the child's psychotherapist-patient privilege was waived with respect to certain materials in the psychotherapist's file.

Whether a guardian ad litem in a dependency and neglect proceeding can waive the child's psychotherapist-patient privilege.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Oral Argument: Thursday, October 4, 2012

Bailiff: Justice Rice's Chambers

9:00 a.m. EN BANC

2011SC333 (45 MINUTES)

Petitioner:

Steven Robles,

٧.

Respondent:

The People of the State of Colorado.

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2006CA934

Docketed: May 11, 2011 At Issue: July 12, 2012 For the Petitioner Steven Robles:

Richard Allen Hostetler LAW FIRM OF RICHARD A HOSTETLER

For the Respondent The People of the State of Colorado:

Joseph G. Michaels OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

ISSUE(S):

Whether the court of appeals erred in finding that the use of a numbers only system for referring to jurors was not reversible error despite the trial court's failure to meet the standard adopted by the court of appeals regarding when a trial court can impanel an anonymous or numbers only jury.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Oral Argument: Thursday, October 4, 2012

Bailiff: Justice Rice's Chambers

9:45 a.m. EN BANC

2010SC616 (45 MINUTES)

Petitioner:

Rene Perez,

٧.

Respondent:

The People of the State of Colorado.

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2008CA2296

Docketed: September 13, 2010 At Issue: December 20, 2011 For the Petitioner Rene Perez:

Thomas Karel Carberry
THOMAS K. CARBERRY, LAWYER

For the Respondent The People of the State of Colorado:

Joseph G. Michaels, Assistant Attorney General OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

ISSUE(S):

Whether the trial court violated petitioner's fundamental rights to a fair and public trial, to the presumption of innocence, and to equal protection, and violated long-standing federal case law, by arbitrarily ruling that the lawyers had to refer to the jurors by number rather than name and by seating an anonymous jury without any justification other than the court's routine policy.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO Oral Argument: Thursday, October 4, 2012

Bailiff: Justice Rice's Chambers

10:30 a.m. EN BANC

2011SC375 (45 MINUTES)

Petitioner:

Martha Rizo,

٧.

Respondent:

The People of the State of Colorado.

Certiorari to the Colorado Court of Appeals, 2009CA1140

Docketed: May 31, 2011 At Issue: March 8, 2012 For the Petitioner Martha Rizo:

Cynthia A. Harvey HARVEY LAW FIRM, LLC

For the Respondent The People of the State of Colorado:

Joseph G. Michaels, Assistant Attorney General OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

ISSUE(S):

Whether the trial court violate petitioner's fundamental rights to a fair and public trial, to the presumption of innocence, and to equal protection, and violated long-standing federal case law, by arbitrarily ruling that the lawyers had to refer to the jurors by number rather than name and by seating an anonymous jury without any justification other than the trial court's routine policy.