			Page of	Page of		
			5/2019	1/2020		
	Rule	Issue	draft set	draft set	source	Proposal (if applicable)
		(1)				
		(h) conflicts with 19-3-702(1)(a) because a				
	C :: 1/D (1)	permanency hearing is triggered by (1) out of home			40/4/40	
	Continued (Deferred)	placement and (2) "following the initial disposition"			10/4/19	
1	Adjudications	(and there is no dispo in a deferred adjudication	28	30	meeting	
	Continued (Deferred)				David's	
1.1	Adjudications	(f) bracketed "dismiss the case"	27	29	Email	take the brackets off
		The 3/15/19 Minutes indicate that the committee				
		wanted the rule to set out procedures for (1)				
		amending terms and conditions (is it adequately				
		addressed by (d)?) and (2) procedures for a successful				
	Continued (Deferred)	parent (does "dismiss the case" in (f) adequately			David's	
1.2	Adjudications	address this or do we need a (4)-there's a placeholder	27-28	29-30	Email	
		(f)(1) worry that the findings described ("whether the				
		Respondent has failed to comply with the terms and				
	Continued (Deferred)	conditions of the continued adjudication") is			Sheri's	
1.3	Adjudications	potentially misleading	28	30	email	
						David supports the second option (no
	Authorizing the Filing of				David's	additional evidence) to avoid mini
2	a Petition	two options of bracketed language	15	17	Email	adjudication hearings
					David's	
3	Pre-trial Motions	(a)(1) has two options for duty to confer	16	18	Email	David supports the second option
					Trent's	C.R.C.P. 5? Cross reference to Reports,
3.1	Pre-trial Motions	(d) (service of motions) is empty	17	19	email	Filings, and Other Pleadings, p. 17 & 19?

			Page of	Page of		
			5/2019	1/2020		
	Rule	Issue	draft set	draft set	source	Proposal (if applicable)
						, , , , ,
						Trent has concerns about providing notice
						of a termination motion to parents by
						giving it to their attorney. He feels notice
						of a termination motion should require
						more diligent efforts by the department or
						GAL to provide actual notice. See
		Should service of termination motions be treated			Trent's	attachment A (excerpt of <i>People in</i>
3.2	Pre-trial Motions	differently?	17	19	email	Interest of M.M.).
						Idea that the court "may" deem a motion
						abandoned doesn't really do anything. If
						the rule said "shall", one would know to
						respond. Otherwise, what purpose does
						this serve? No one would risk not
	Pre-trial Motions(a) &					responding, even if a motion has no legal
	Responsive Pleadings				Trent's	authority, since that "may" be a
3.3	and Motions(fg)		16 & 22	18 &24	email	confession.
		Should this rule (1) apply only to adjudication				
	Responsive Pleadings	procedures or (2) be the general rule for all motions			David's	
4	and Motions	and moved to the front	22	24	Email	
		(a) by adding continued adjudication to this section,			61 11	
	Responsive Pleadings	are we extending the timeframe for denying			Sheri's	
4.1	and Motions	jurisdictional matters longer than we need?	22	24	email	
	Posponsivo Plandings	(a) Do we want to explicitly state that the court has			Sheri's	
1 12	Responsive Pleadings and Motions	(e) Do we want to explicitly state that the court has the discretion to shorten these timeframes?	22	24	email	
4.2	สาเน เขเบนบาร	the discretion to shorten these timenames?		24	eman	

			Page of	Page of		
			5/2019	1/2020		
	Rule	Issue	draft set	draft set	source	Proposal (if applicable)
		From 3/14/19 minutes: The committee agreed that				
		peremptory challenges should be allocated per				
		aligned side and that each aligned side should get				
		equal numbers of challenges. John Thirkell (with				
	Trial By Jury-	assistance from J.J. Wallace) will work on developing				See Attachment B. Further work? CRCP
	(d)Peremptory	a draft rule incorporating the committee's ideas. See			David's	47(h) ("Each side shall be entitled to four
5	Challenges	attached emails.	29	31	Email	peremptory challenges")?
					David's	6 months is too short and 2 years is more
6	Form Release	Length of time release is active	39	43	email	appropriate because the client can revoke
		(c) is titled "Persons Exempted from <i>Discovery and</i>				
		Disclosures " and the last sentence says GALs are				
		exempted from <i>discovery</i> (there's no reference to			Trent's	
7	Discovery	disclosures).	7-8	10	email	
						This has been discussed before and
						perhaps training RPC to put the request as
					Trent's	a sentence on their entry of appearance
7.1	Disclosures	(f) requires disclosures "upon written request"	8	10	email	adquately addresses the issue
		we want to make sure we are not creating a new				
		standard of practice regarding depos, requests for				
		admissions, interrogatories, and requests for			Sheri's	
7.2	Discovery	production	6+	8+	email	
		L.,,				
		Is this an ex parte process? And/or should there be an				
	Order to Interview or	opportunity to respond, especially in the instance			Trent's	
8	Examine Child	where parents are represented?	13-14	15-16	email	

			_	Page of		
			•	1/2020		
	Rule	Issue	draft set	draft set	source	Proposal (if applicable)
		Should we say that an application for an order to				
	Order to Interview or	interview or examine chidl shall be supported by			Sheri's	
8.1	Examine Child	affidavit rather than in the form of an affidavit?	13-14	15-16	email	
					Trent's	
9	Temporary Custody	(c) Relative Affidavit and Advisement	14	16		These two rules' references to the relative
					Trent's	affidavit seem inconsistent
9.1	Discovery	(e)(2) also relative affidavit	8	10	email	
		Much of this language is already in the statute and				
		some of the language contradicts the exisiting				
		statute. For example, section 19-3-405(2)(a) uses the				
		language "danger to the child's life or health in the				
		reasonably foreseeable future." If we are going to				
		repeat statutory language, we need to compare this				
		to 19-3-405 and 19-3-403 to make sure we are			Sheri's	
9.2	Temporary Custody	consistent	14	16	email	
	Emergency Protection	(d) doesn't say what happens if the Department does			Trent's	
10	Orders	not file a motion to continue	15	17	email	
		(a)-"in person or through counsel" may be unclear				
		because ORPC is often provisionally appointed and				
	Adjudication on Non-	may appear, so technically a parent would appear				
	Appearing or Non-	through counsel even though they were not actually			Trent's	
11	Defending Respondent	there	28	30	email	
		(b) Given some of the recent case law regarding				
	Adjudication on Non-	offers of proof, we just want to make sure we are not				
	Appearing or Non-	creating apepalable issues with this procedure of			Sheri's	
11.1	Defending Respondent	adjudication based on motion and affidavit	28	30	email	