

<p>Colorado Supreme Court 2 East 14th Avenue Denver, Colorado 80203</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲</p>
<p>Original Proceeding Pursuant to § 1-40-107(2), C.R.S. (2015) Appeal from the Ballot Title Board</p>	
<p>In the Matter of the Title, Ballot Title and Submission Clause for Proposed Initiative 2015- 2016 #116 (“Retention of Excess State Revenue”)</p> <p>Petitioners: Natalie Menten;</p> <p>v.</p> <p>Respondents: Dan Ritchie and Albert Yates;</p> <p>and</p> <p>Title Board: Suzanne Staiert, Frederick R. Yarger and Jason Gelender.</p>	<p>Supreme Court Case No.: 2016SA138</p>
<p><i>Attorneys for Respondents</i> Dee P. Wisor, #7237 Martina Hinojosa, #46353 BUTLER SNOW LLP 1801 California Street, Suite 5100 Denver, Colorado 80202 Telephone: (720) 330-2300 Fax: (720) 330-2301 Email: dee.wisor@butlersnow.com martina.hinojosa@butlersnow.com</p>	
<p>RESPONDENTS’ ANSWER BRIEF</p>	

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that this brief complies with all requirements of C.A.R. 28 and C.A.R. 32, including all formatting requirements set forth in these rules. Specifically, the undersigned certifies that:

This brief complies with C.A.R. 28(g).

It contains 286 words.

This brief complies with C.A.R. 28(a)(7)(A).

For the party raising the issue:

It contains under a separate heading (1) a concise statement of the applicable standard of appellate review with citation to authority; and (2) a citation to the precise location in the record, not to an entire document, where the issue was raised and ruled on.

I acknowledge that my brief may be stricken if it fails to comply with any of the requirements of C.A.R. 28 and C.A.R. 32.

s/ Dee P. Wisor

Dee P. Wisor

s/ Martina Hinojosa

Martina Hinojosa

BUTLER SNOW LLP
Attorneys for Respondents
Dan Ritchie and Albert Yates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE..... i
TABLE OF CONTENTS..... ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii
ARGUMENT 1
CONCLUSION 2
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Barnett v. Elite Props. of Am., Inc., 252 P.3d 14 (Colo. App. 2010)1
Sinclair Transp. Co. v. Sandberg, 350 P.3d 924 (Colo. App. 2014).....1

Rules

C.A.R. 28(A).....1

Respondents Dan Ritchie and Albert Yates (the “Proponents”), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby submit their Answer Brief:

ARGUMENT

In her Opening Brief, Petitioner Natalie Menten (the “Petitioner”) states several propositions of law pertaining to the single subject rule. R. Petitioner’s Opening Brief, pp. 3-6. However, the Petitioner fails to connect these propositions of law to her contention that Proposed Ballot Initiative #116 (“Initiative #116”), Proposed Ballot Initiative #117 (“Initiative #117”) and Proposed Ballot Initiative #118 (“Initiative #118,” and together with Initiative #116 and Initiative #117, the “Initiatives”) contain more than a single subject. Pursuant to C.A.R. 28(A), the Court is not required to address “bald legal proposition[s] presented without argument or development.” *See, e.g., Barnett v. Elite Props. of Am., Inc.*, 252 P.3d 14, 19 (Colo. App. 2010); *Sinclair Transp. Co. v. Sandberg*, 350 P.3d 924, 935-36 (Colo. App. 2014); *see also* R. Title Board’s Opening Brief p. 7. Because the Petitioner has failed to provide any legal analysis to support her position that the Initiatives contain more than a single subject, the Court should uphold the decisions of the Title Board.

As the Proponents argued in their Opening Brief, the purposes for which the retained revenues may be spent merely explain the single subject of the Initiatives,

which is to authorize the state to retain excess revenues. R. Respondents' Opening Brief, p. 9. These purposes do not constitute additional subjects. Accordingly, the Court should uphold the decisions of the Title Board.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein and in Respondents' Opening Brief, the Proponents respectfully request that the Court uphold the title, ballot title and submission clause for Initiative #116, Initiative #117 and Initiative #118.

Respectfully submitted this 26th day of May, 2016.

s/ Dee P. Wisor

Dee P. Wisor

s/ Martina Hinojosa

Martina Hinojosa

BUTLER SNOW LLP
Attorneys for Respondents
Dan Ritchie and Al Yates

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 26, 2016, I filed a true and correct copy of the foregoing RESPONDENTS' ANSWER BRIEF using the ICCES electronic filing system and served electronic copies to the following:

Rebecca R. Sopkin
2945 Parfet Drive
Lakewood, Colorado 80215

William M. Banta
8101 East Prentice Avenue, Suite 650
Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111
Attorneys for Petitioner

Cynthia H. Coffman, Attorney General
Matthew D. Grove
Leann Morrill
1300 Broadway, 6th Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
Attorneys for Title Board