

# QUARTERLY REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL

**Relating to:**  
LITIGATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

---

**May 2015**  
(Covering All Activity Through May 27, 2015)

  
Wynetta Massey  
City Attorney/Chief Legal Officer



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<b>Litigation Section</b>	
Disposed Cases	3
New Cases	5
Current Cases (listed by department)	8
<b>Administrative Section</b>	
EEOC/CCRD	
Disposed Matters	33
New Matters	33
Current Matters	35
<b>Utilities</b>	
Water Court Cases	38
<b>Workers Compensation</b>	39
<b>Hospital Collection Matters</b>	39
<b>Criminal Prosecutions Section</b>	40

## LITIGATION SECTION

In this section, the symbol “(IC)” indicates representation by insurance counsel; “(OC)” indicates representation by outside counsel on a contract basis; and “(CC)” indicates that a staff attorney is co-counsel with either outside or insurance counsel. All other litigation matters are handled completely by the City Attorney’s Office staff attorneys. *NOTE: Hours worked are cumulative and reflect combined time of attorneys and paralegals.*

### DISPOSED CASES

City of Colorado Springs v. Lucinda Dorsey

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2014CV032735

CLAIM: Appeal of municipal court concerning construction of deferred sentence conditions, the City appealed as a matter of law.

STATUS: Notice of Appeal filed August 29, 2014. October 30, 2014 City files opening brief. No answer brief was filed. **February 13, 2015 District Court issued order reversing municipal court.**

(Total \_\_hours – Curran)

Erindale Holdings, LLC, a Colorado limited liability company v. Erindale Place Townhome Association, a Colorado Non-Profit Corporation, aka Erindale Townhome Association, aka Erindale Place Homeowners Association, aka Erindale Place Homeowners Association, Inc., the City of Colorado Springs, a Home Rule Municipality

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2013CV30946

CLAIM: Plaintiff seeks declaratory relief that each of the Erindale Lots is entitled to easement over Common Areas within the Plat and seeks rights, status and legal relations between parties and award Plaintiff attorneys’ fees from the HOA.

STATUS: February 2, 2014 Summons and Amended Complaint served. February 28, 2014 City files Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Jury Demand to First Amended Complaint. Four day trial scheduled for December 2, 2014. September 23, 2014 Defendants Erindale Association files motion in limine regarding plaintiff’s expert witness. November 26, 2014 Parties reached a settlement in the form of an easement and development agreement and are working on stipulation; a motion to vacate trial date is filed with the Court. **February 17, 2015 Joint stipulated motion for declaratory judgment and decree quieting title. February 25, 2015 Court grants order regarding declaratory judgment and order and decree quieting title.**

(Total 192.35 hours – Lamphere)

Mazin, David v. Jeffrey True, in his official and individual capacity; Kristin Genta, in her official and individual capacity; Erin Land, in her official and individual capacity; Henry Hasler, in his individual capacity; Noel Peterson, in his individual capacity; Barbara Brohl, in her official capacity; Laura Harris, in her official capacity; and City of Colorado Springs, Colorado

United States District Court Case Number 14-cv-00654 REB-CBS

CLAIM: Plaintiff brings unreasonable search and seizure and procedural due process claims against Defendants for destroying medical marijuana plants causing damages.

STATUS: March 18, 2014 Summons and Complaint served. April 2, 2014 Entry of Appearance filed by Anne Turner for City Defendants. Scheduling conference set for May 27,

2014 was converted to a motions hearing to hear the opposed motion for protective order filed by Defendants on April 30, 2014. April 28, 2014 City Defendants file motion to dismiss. April 29, 2014 State Defendants file motion to dismiss. April 30, 2014 Defendant Land files motion to dismiss. June 6, 2014 Plaintiff files amended complaint and jury demand and state defendants file renewed motion to dismiss. June 20, 2014 Defendants Hasler, Peterson, Brohl and Harris motion to dismiss is withdrawn; Defendants True, Genta, City of Colorado Springs and Land motions to dismiss are denied as moot; all Defendants file new motions to dismiss amended complaint. July 21, 2014 Plaintiff files consolidated response to Defendants' motion to dismiss. August 4, 2014 all Defendants file reply briefs in support of motions to dismiss. February 4, 2015 Magistrate Judge recommends dismissal with prejudice of all claims and grants City Defendants' motion to stay discovery. **March 16, 2015 Court adopts recommendation of the US Magistrate Judge and grants City's motion to dismiss amended complaint and that the complaint is dismissed with prejudice. March 30, 2015 Parties submit stipulation as to costs and waiving appeal.** (Total 294.95 hours – Turner)

(OC)

Mohamad, Nancy C. v. McDonald Transit Associates, Inc. and the City of Colorado Springs

El Pas County District Court Case No. 13CV30621

CLAIM: Plaintiff alleges that due to negligence, unlawfulness and carelessness of a bus driver, Plaintiff fell causing injuries and damages.

STATUS: Complaint filed July 24, 2013. August 30, 2013 Defendant McDonald files answer. October 7, 2013 City files answer. Discovery ongoing. Four-day trial was set to begin Monday, January 26, 2015. Parties have reached settlement. **March 13, 2015 Court grants dismissal with prejudice.**

(Total – 3 hours / E. Kennedy at Hall & Evans, LLC)

(OC)

Scott, Danielle v. The City of Colorado Springs

United States District Court Case No. 12-cv-01028

CLAIM: Plaintiff, an Accounting Supervisor at the Colorado Springs Airport, alleges that due to manufactured allegations against her in 2010, she was discriminated against multiple times due to race. She also claims she was retaliated against for engaging in protected activity. Plaintiff alleges she was denied more than one promotion, adequate training, and that there is a pattern and practice of disparate treatment of black employees. Plaintiff seeks damages.

STATUS: On June 15, 2012 City filed motion to dismiss Plaintiff's fourth claim for relief; City filed Answer and jury demand. Court granted City's motion to dismiss fourth claim for relief. Discovery has commenced. March 27, 2013 Defendants file motion for summary judgment of Plaintiff's claims. June 10, 2013 Plaintiff files Response in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. June 24, 2013 Defendants file reply to its motion for summary judgment of Plaintiff's claims pursuant to F/R/C/P/ Rule 56 and request for oral argument. Hearing on Defendant's motion for summary judgment held September 9, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. Court stays case, including discovery pending Plaintiff's receipt and filing of EEOC's notice of right to sue and an amended complaint is filed with new charges after termination. Plaintiff filed First Amended Complaint and Jury Demand on February 14, 2014. The court dismissed the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment as Moot, and Defendant filed the Answer to Amended Complaint on March 13, 2014. A status conference was held April 25<sup>th</sup>,

2014 regarding discovery, and the discovery cutoff deadline is September 15, 2014. Plaintiff Scott propounded Plaintiff's Third Written Discovery Requests, with responses due by the City on August 1, 2014. A settlement conference was scheduled for January 8, 2015, and Jury Trial is set for June 8, 2015. Settlement has been reached. Stipulations to dismiss are filed. **March 19, 2015 Court files order of dismissal.**

(Total 228.1 hours – Lessig / Richard Orona – Mullins, Piersel & Reed, P.C.)

United Parcel Service v. Skyway Condominium Association, Inc., and The City of Colorado Springs

El Paso County District Court Case Number 2014CV031122

CLAIM: Plaintiff is making subrogation claims against the Defendants for moneys paid out on a sidewalk slip and fall case.

STATUS: April 24, 2014 Summons and Complaint served. May 15, 2014 The City files Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Jury Demand. May 31, 2014 Defendant Skyway Condominium Association files Answer. September 2, 2014 Court issues Delay Prevention Order directing Plaintiff to set matter for trial. September 10, 2014 Jury trial scheduled for April 20-24, 2015. **March 30, 2015 Parties file notice of settlement and resolution. April 6, 2015 Parties file stipulation for dismissal with prejudice. April 14, 2015 Court orders dismissal.**

(Total 75.2 hours – Turner)

David H. Zook and Dale Street Bistro Café, LLC v. Colorado Springs Utilities and City of Colorado Springs

El Paso County Court Case No. 2015C635

CLAIM: Plaintiff claims that CSU caused damage to property due to a sewer backup.

STATUS: Summons and Complaint hand delivered to Mayor on April 21, 2015. April 24, 2015 City Defendants file motion to dismiss for lack of service of process. April 27, 2015 Court granted motion to dismiss.

(Total 11.1 hours – Turner)

## NEW CASES

Rebecca Arndt, Nicole Baldwin, Cathy Buckley, Stacey Clark, Donya Davis, Julie Garrett, Carolyn Graves, Samantha Lembergs, Jennifer Lewis, Geraldine Pring, Magdalena Santos, and Terry Thrumston v. City of Colorado Springs

United States District Court Case No. 2015-cv-00922

CLAIM: Plaintiffs allege age and sex discrimination and violations of due process after department wide physical abilities testing ("PAT") was initiated.

STATUS: Complaint and Summons served May 1, 2015. City's Responsive pleading is due May 22, 2015.

(Total \_\_ hours – Linden/Lessig)

Christopher Beddingfield v. Christopher Brown; and Drew Jeltel; and the City of Colorado Springs

United States District Court Case No. 15-cv-00846-MJW

CLAIM: Plaintiff makes multiple claims including allegations of violations of due process stating false imprisonment and unlawful search and seizure.

STATUS: Complaint and Summons served May 6, 2015. Scheduling Conference set June 25, 2015.  
(Total \_\_ hours – Turner)

Clara Haas v. The City of Colorado Springs, the County of El Paso, Colorado Springs World Arena and H2 Properties, LLC of Arizona, LLC

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2015CV30940

CLAIM: Plaintiff brings claim for City and other Defendants' alleged failure to maintain sidewalk causing damages.

STATUS: Complaint and Summons served April 21, 2015. May 15, 2015 City files Answer.

(Total 9.6 hours - Gendill)

Maureen M. Marchant; William Marchant; William Howell as Trustee of the Marilyn Howell Trust; Darrell H. Oliver; and William M. Peck v. The City of Colorado Springs, a Colorado Home Rule City; Woodmen Heights Metropolitan District No. 1; Woodmen Heights Metropolitan District No. 2; and Woodmen Heights Metropolitan District No. 3, Title 32 Metropolitan Districts

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2014CV34262

CLAIM: Plaintiffs bring an inverse condemnation claim based on the ruling of the Court in case 2008CV4553.

STATUS: Complaint filed November 25, 2014 and served March 3, 2015. March 23, 2015 Defendant City of Colorado Springs files Motion to Dismiss; March 24, 2015 WHMD files motion to dismiss. April 20, 2015 Plaintiff files combined response to City and WHMD's motions to dismiss. April 28, 2015 City files reply to its motion to dismiss. May 4, 2015 WHMD files reply to its motion to dismiss. On May 22, 2015, Court grants City's motion to dismiss.

(Total 47.7 hours – White)

James A. Reed, P.C. a Colorado Corporation v. The City of Colorado Springs, a body politic and corporate and a home rule City and political subdivision of the State of Colorado; The Colorado Springs Police Department; Officer E. Frederic, CSPD; and Dan May, as the District Attorney for the Fourth Judicial District, State of Colorado

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2015CV31118

CLAIM: Plaintiff claims that monies in Plaintiff's COLTAF/trust account holding funds for Justin Kruse were wrongfully seized by CSPD.

STATUS: Plaintiff files an emergency complaint for relief and return of property seized by search warrant under Rule 41(e) C.R.Cr.P. and serves Summons and Complaint on April 22, 2015. Complaint served April 24, 2015. May 6, 2015 City Defendants file joint answer and affirmative defenses. An emergency hearing commenced on May 7, 2015 at 10:30 a.m. Court reviewed documents *in camera* and issues ruling as to which funds may be held and which funds must be released.

(Total 22.4 hours – Lamphere)

Arick Justin Rinaldo and the Estate of Kaitlin Cara Kendall Rinaldo v. Dr. Bryan M. Mahan; University of Colorado Health Care; Memorial Hospital Security Guards; Robin Chitham;

Jeremy her assistant; The Colorado Springs Police Officers; Persons on Memorial Hospital Committee; Kristen Hoffecker; Linda Rogain; Dr. Keenan; Penrose and St. Frances Hospitals; Centura Pikes Peak Palative and Hospice Care; The agents and employees, et al.

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2015CV38

CLAIM: Plaintiff brings various claims relating to his wife's care and his rights to his wife's care.

STATUS: March 10, 2015 Summons and Complaint served. March 5, 2015 Defendants Memorial Hospital and Catholic Health Initiatives file motion to dismiss. March 30, 2015 Colorado Springs Police Officers file motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' amended complaint. April 2, 2015 Defendant Hoffecker files motion to dismiss. May 5, 2015 Court grants Elizabeth Kleiner, M.D.'s motion to dismiss. Pikes Peak Palative and Hospice Care and State Defendants file motion to dismiss. May 21, 2015, Court grants Colorado Springs Police Officers' motion to dismiss.

(Total 34.8 hours – White)

Francis Rudnicki and Pamela Rudnicki individually, and as parents, guardians and next friends of Alexander Rudnicki, a minor child v. Peter Bianco, D.O. and the City of Colorado Springs, dba Memorial Health System

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2014CV34013

CLAIM: Plaintiff claims negligence and other claims against Dr. Bianco and Memorial Hospital and alleges that due to their negligence Plaintiff suffered damages, losses and permanent impairment.

STATUS: Summons and Complaint served February 5, 2015. March 12, 2015 City files Motion to Dismiss. The Motion to Dismiss was granted in part and denied in part. City will file its Answer on May 7, 2015.

(DeLine / Retherford, Mullen & Moore)

Michael E. Wahl v. Wallace W. Berntson; Maxine L. Berntson, Joseph A. Cammalleri aka Joseph Anthony Cammalleri; Virginia M. Cammalleri aka Virginia Mary Cammalleri; Angela Mirandi Stein aka Angela Stein; Millard C. Port; Geraldine S. Port; Dennis E. Pearce; J. Forrest Thompson; City of Colorado Springs; El Paso County, Colorado; and all unknown persons who claim any interest in the subject property described herein

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2015CV30754

CLAIM: Plaintiff brings quiet title claim for his real property and for complete adjudication of the rights of the parties.

STATUS: Complaint to quiet title under C.R.C.P. 105 and Summons served March 20, 2015. The parties are attempting to resolve issues regarding an easement granted to the City/CSU by one of the defendants. May 15, 2015 City files Answer.

(Total 38.1 hours – Gendill)

David H. Zook and Dale Street Bistro Café, LLC v. Colorado Springs Utilities and City of Colorado Springs

El Paso County Court Case No. 2015C635

*See Disposed Cases*

## CURRENT CASES

### CITY CLERK

#### The Colorado Springs Citizens for Community Rights' Petition Committee v. City of Colorado Springs, Colorado

El Paso County District Court Case Number 13CV2082

CLAIM: Plaintiff files Complaint seeking declaratory and injunctive relief regarding the Colorado Springs Title Review Board's May 2, 2013 final decision concerning Proposed Charter Amendment IO 2013-001, known as "Community Bill of Rights Protection from Natural Gas & Oil Production" which sought regulation on oil and gas exploration, including fracking within the jurisdiction of the City of Colorado Springs. The Title Board rejected the Proposed Charter Amendment.

STATUS: On and before April 14, 2014, in a series of rulings, Court dismisses Plaintiff's claims. June 2, 2014 Citizens file Notice of Appeal. Parties file designation of records. August 26, 2014 Notice of electronic record certified to Court of Appeals. September 24, 2014 Notice of filing of record on appeal. Opening brief filed November 5, 2014. Court of appeals struck Plaintiff's opening brief due to deficiencies. Plaintiffs have 14 days to correct deficiencies and refile brief. December 2, 2014 Colorado Springs Citizens for Community Rights files amended opening brief. January 6, 2015 City files Appellees' Answer Brief. January 20, 2015 City files Answer Brief. February 10, 2015 Citizens' file reply brief. **February 16, 2015 Citizens file request for Oral Argument. May 11, 2015 Oral argument set for July 28, 2015.**

(Total 370.2 hours – Gendill).

### CITY ENGINEERING

#### Contract Management Inc, d/b/a US Roads v. City of Colorado Springs and Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority.

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2013CV30652

#### **Colorado Court of Appeals Case No. 2015CA671**

CLAIM: US Roads was awarded a contract through an Invitation to Bid to perform certain road improvements to Platte Avenue in Colorado Springs (the "Project"). Plaintiff claims City Defendants breached the contract that was executed on July 29, 2011 and received unjust enrichment at the expense of US Roads.

STATUS: June 16, 2014 Defendant City of Colorado Springs files Motion for Summary Judgment. July 28, 2014 Plaintiff files response to Defendant City's motion for summary judgment. August 8, 2014 Defendant City files reply in support of its motion for summary judgment. September 4, 2014 Notice of stipulation for dismissal of Defendant Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority. A six day trial was rescheduled to begin March 30, 2015. Parties file motions in limine, responses and replies. February 2, 2015 Plaintiff and City Defendant's file supplemental briefing on their motion for summary judgment. **Court grants City Defendant's motion for summary judgment. March 18, 2015 City files Notice and Bill of Costs and Motion for Award of Attorney's Fees. April 22, 2015 US Roads as Appellant files Notice of Appeal. April 23, 2015 Court awards Defendants Bill of Costs but denies Attorney's Fees.**

**On April 23, 2015, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal. May 18, 2015 City files supplemental designation of record.**

(Total 1223 hours – Gendill)

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION AND REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS FOR AUTHORITY TO FORMALIZE A SHARED USE TRAIL AND CROSSING, INSTALL WARNING DEVICES AND IMPROVED APPROACH AT THE CROSSING OF THE MANITOU & PIKES PEAK COG RAILWAY TRACK ON THE NORTH LAKE MORAINNE CONNECTOR AT 38 @ 50' 01.6"N, 104@ 59'26.94"W IN EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado Docket NO. 12A-006R

**APPLICATION:** The City applies to the Public Utilities Commission for authorization to formalize a shared-use trail and crossing, install warning devices and improved approach at the crossing of the Manitou & Pikes Peak COG Railway track and requesting a waiver of the Commission's rule requiring Pedestrian crossings to be Grade Separated.

**STATUS:** City files notice of application and petition. Commission order deems application complete, grants application, and grants petition for variance.

(Total 37 hours – M. Smith)

COUNCIL

(OC)

Bruce, Douglas v. City of Colorado Springs and Does I through XX

El Paso County District Court Case Number 2013CV268

**CLAIM:** Plaintiff alleges unlawful activity by the City regarding Council Benefits, Attorney Compensation, Violations of Issue 300, Sales Tax Vendor Retention, and Utility Turn on Charges, Customer Water Usage, Appointee Review and Appropriation of Salaries and requests proper injunctive and declaratory relief.

**STATUS:** August 2, 2013 Summons and Complaint served. August 23, 2013 City files its Answer. September 18, 2013 PERA files motion to intervene. October 25, 2013 PERA files motion to dismiss first cause of action. October 28, 2013 Plaintiff files motion to amend complaint and motion for default judgment against City, asserting City being represented by outside counsel illegally. November 13, 2013 City files responses to Plaintiff's motion to amend complaint and motion for default judgment. November 15, 2013 Plaintiff files answer to PERA's motion to dismiss first cause of action. November 15, 2013 Plaintiff files answer to PERA's motion to dismiss first cause of action. November 18, 2013 Plaintiff files reply to his motion for default judgment; Plaintiff files reply to his motion to amend complaint. December 3, 2013 Court denies Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment. December 18, 2013 Plaintiff files amended complaint. January 2, 2014 City files answer to Plaintiff's amended complaint. January 13, 2014 City files 1) motion to dismiss cause of action 3 and motion for summary judgment as to causes of action 4 and 8 and 2) motion to dismiss causes of action 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7. Plaintiff files response to City's Motions 1) and 2) above on February 4, 2014 and February 6, 2014, respectively. February 17, 2014 City files reply in support of motion to dismiss causes 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 and separate reply in support of motion to dismiss causes 4 and 8. March 2, 2014 Court rules on City's motions to dismiss and motion for summary judgment: 1) the first cause of action is dismissed as to Councilmember participation in PERA, but not as to

travel and meeting expenses; 2) the second cause of action is dismissed as to the City Attorney's ability to hire outside counsel, but not as to the setting of the City Attorney salaries; 3) the fifth cause of action is dismissed in its entirety; and 4) the City's motions to dismiss third cause of action and motion for summary judgment on fourth and eighth causes are denied. March 6, 2014 the parties participate in a case management conference, as a result the April trial is vacated and reset to November 2014. At the CMC, deadlines for discovery, Rule 56 motions, motions in limine, and substantive motions are set. March 17, 2014 Plaintiff files a motion for reconsideration of the partial dismissals. April 7, 2014 PERA and the City file responses to the motion for reconsideration. April 7, 2014 the Court denies Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration. On March 18, 2014 the City takes Plaintiff's deposition. The City has received the draft transcript, but an amendment sheet has not been received yet. Written discovery is ongoing but not without issues. April 18, 2014 the parties participate in a lengthy discovery hearing. April 25, 2014 Plaintiff provides non-responsive and evasive responses to the City's first set of discovery requests. May 5, 2014 the City files a motion to compel responses to the City's first set of discovery requests. The City owes responses to Plaintiff's written discovery request by May 8, 2014; however the Court ruled that the City could recover the cost of time and copies for the discovery response. The discovery cutoff is May 30, 2014. May 23, 2014 the City provided its Response to Plaintiff's Amended First Discovery. May 29, 2014 the Court grants the City's Motion to Compel. Plaintiff files an objection to the Order granting the motion to compel and Plaintiff requests sanctions but on June 16, 2014 the Court denies Plaintiff's objection and request for sanctions. On June 17, 2014 Plaintiff files Plaintiff's Inquiry on Pre-Trial Status. On July 16, 2014 the Court files an order stating that it has reviewed Plaintiff's June 17, 2014 filing. July 1, 2014 City files motion for ruling on questions of law on Plaintiff's remaining claims in causes of action 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 pursuant to C.R.C.P. 56(h). City also files motion for sanctions. July 28, 2014 Plaintiff filed responses to motion for sanctions and motion for ruling on questions of law. August 4, 2014 City files Reply in Support of its Motions. August 8, 2014 Court issues lengthy order addressing each of the remaining claims and dismisses Plaintiff's causes of action 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. August 18, 2014 Court issues an Order directing Plaintiff to file his Motion to Certify Class by September 8, 2014. August 18, 2014 Court also issues an Order directing Plaintiff to set a case management conference to hear argument on the City's Motion for Sanctions and address Plaintiff's ability to represent a class on the 8<sup>th</sup> cause of action. August 22, 2014 the City files a Motion for Leave to File Motion for Ruling on Questions of Law Relating to Plaintiff's 8<sup>th</sup> Cause of Action Pursuant to CRCP 56(h). September 2, 2014 Plaintiff files his Motion to Certify Class. September 9, 2014 Plaintiff files a response to the City's Motion for Leave. September 16, 2014 City files Reply in Support of Motion for Leave. September 19, 2014 the Court grants the City's Motion for Leave to File Motion for Ruling on Questions of Law. September 23, 2014 City files its Hearing Brief. September 26, 2014 City files a Motion to Consider Hearing Brief as City's Response to Plaintiff's Motion to Certify Class, which Motion was granted by the Court on September 30, 2014. October 9, 2014 Court grants Motion for Sanctions and sets deadline of 21 days for the City to file a Bill of Costs related to the Discovery Sanctions. October 10, 2014 Court denies Plaintiff's Motion to Certify Class. October 14, 2014 city files Motion for Ruling Pursuant to CRCP 56(h) on Plaintiff's 8<sup>th</sup> Cause of Action. Also on October 14, 2014 the Court holds a Case Management Conference. October 24, 2014 Court grants Defendant's motion for ruling pursuant to C.R.C.P. 56(h) on Plaintiff's eighth cause of action. October 30, 2014 City files a Bill of Costs Pursuant to the Order on Motion for Sanctions. November 4, 2014 Plaintiff files an Objection to

the City's Bill of Costs, a reply thereto is due on November 12, 2014. The City's Bill of Costs relating to final judgment in the case is due November 14, 2014. The trial has been vacated. December 1, 2014 The Court orders that Plaintiff is to pay bill of costs in the amount of \$7,569.61 to Defendant City of Colorado Springs. December 31, 2014 Bruce files a Notice of Appeal. January 21, 2015, the City files a Motion to Dismiss Appeal. January 22, 2015 Bruce files a Request to Stay the Money Judgment. January 30, 2015 the City files a Response to the Request for Stay. February 2, 2015 Bruce files a response to the City's Motion to Dismiss. Court of Appeals dismissed Bruce's appeal regarding the dismissed claims, however allowed appeal to proceed regarding order for costs. Court of Appeals denies Bruce's motion to stay. **March 24, 2015, the court files a Notice of Filing of Record on Appeal and Briefing Schedule which sets the Opening Brief deadline as May 5, 2015. April 30, 2015, Bruce files Motion for Extension asking for his opening brief deadline to be extended to June 22, 2015. May 1, 2015, City files a response to the Motion objecting to the extension requested and agreeing to a two week extension. May 7, 2015, Court orders opening brief is due June 22, 2015. The City's Answer Brief is due 35 days from the date Bruce files his Opening Brief. May 4, 2015, Douglas Bruce pays judgment amount plus interest to the City.**

(Total 262.4 hours – White - Carberry / Hayes, Phillips, Hoffman, Parker, Wilson & Carberry, P.C.)

MLP Receiverships, LLC, as Receiver; Probuild Company LLC; and PNC Bank, NA v. The City of Colorado Springs, a Colorado home rule city and municipal corporation; and City Council of the City of Colorado Springs in their official capacity.

El Paso County District Court Case Number 2013CV1973

CLAIM: MLP Receiverships file a Request for Judicial Review under Rule 106(a)(4) and complaint claiming 14<sup>th</sup> amendment due process, estoppels and taking for City's stopping of permit construction of Dublin Townhomes and refusal to approve amended application.

STATUS: April 23, 2013 Complaint filed with motion to certify the record. May 13, 2013 Plaintiff files Amended Complaint. May 17, 2013 City files waiver and acceptance of service; Plaintiff files motion to consolidate or in the alternative motion to transfer rule 106 action to Division 19 with PNC Bank, et al. v. Heritage Homes, et al. El Paso County Case Number 2012CV3256. June 7, 2013 City files Answer to First Amended Complaint and response in opposition to motion to certify the record and response to motion to consolidate and a partial motion to dismiss. June 13, 2013 MLP Receivership files replies to City responses regarding motion to certify record and motion to consolidate. June 19, 2013 Defendant City files motion for leave to file sur-reply re: motion to certify the record for C.R.C.P. 106(a)(4). June 20, 2013 City files joint motion to bifurcate and for partial stay. June 27, 2013 Court grants order which stipulates transferring Rule 106 action to Division 19. August 14, 2013 Court grants order to bifurcate and for partial stay; Court orders Defendants shall prepare, certify and file docs within 60 days for certification of the record. September 12, 2013 Defendants file certified record of proceedings. October 24, 2013 Plaintiff files opening brief and request for oral argument. November 27, 2013 City files answer brief. December 23, 2013 Plaintiff files reply brief. Oral Argument is set for February 25, 2014. March 27, 2014 Court files C.R.C.P. Rule 106(a)(4) Review stating that City Council abused their discretion in the appeal and the issue is remanded back to Colorado Springs City Council for rehearing. April 11, 2014 Court orders that the remaining claims in the case shall be stayed pending resolution of the C.R.C.P. 106(a)(4) issues on remand to the Colorado Springs City Council. July 10, 2014 Plaintiff files Status Report.

October 27, 2014 Plaintiff files status report stating that City notified counsel that a hearing regarding the Amended Development Plan has been scheduled for January 13, 2015 at City Council. Court Ordered remand and rehearing before City Council. The parties are currently working on a resolution. Court permitted the parties to stay the rehearing until a settlement can be fully explored. **The parties reached a resolution of all claims and signed a settlement agreement and, per the Court's Order, the matter was brought before City Council for a re-hearing on the initial denial of the proposed amendment to the Development Plan. Both parties requested City Council approve the proposed Development Plan amendment, with the conditions set forth in the parties settlement agreement. City Council approved the development plan with the parties conditions on a 8-0 vote. The parties are awaiting the Court's approval of the settlement agreement and dismissal of the action.**

(Total 456.5 hours – Gendill)

## FACILITIES

(OC)

Smokebrush Foundation, Katherine Tudor and Donald Herbert Goede, III v. City of Colorado Springs and Hudspeth & Associates, Inc.

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2013CV1469

CLAIM: Plaintiffs claim that Defendants allowed asbestos, heavy metals and other toxic substances to migrate offsite during demolition of 25 Cimino Drive in a harmful manner and seek claims for relief of strict liability, negligence, trespass, nuisance and negligence *per se*.

STATUS: March 20, 2013 Summons and Complaint served. April 12, 2013 Hearing regarding Motion for Preliminary Injunction concerning condition of property. April 16, 2013 Plaintiffs file Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”). April 18, 2013 Defendant City of Colorado Springs files Motion to Dismiss, amended. April 19, 2013 Defendant Hudspeth files Response to Motion for TRO; Defendant City files Response to Motion for TRO; Defendant Hudspeth files Motion to Stay re: CRS §13-20-803.5(9). May 7, 2013 Plaintiff files Amended Complaint. August 2, 2013 City files motion to dismiss. August 23, 2013 Plaintiffs file response to City's motion to dismiss. September 6, 2013 City files reply to its motion to dismiss. On September 25, 2013, the Court issued an order concluding that there are factual issues that are potentially relevant and ordered that a *Trinity* hearing would be necessary to resolve the issues stated in the motion. A *Trinity* hearing regarding the motion to dismiss was set for November 15, 2013, but was rescheduled to November 20, 2013. December 20, 2013 Court issues order denying City's motion to dismiss and finding that some or all of Plaintiff's damages were caused by the operation of a public building and the maintenance and operation of a gas facility, thereby waiving the City's immunity. January 8, 2014 City files Answer and Affirmative Defenses. February 4, 2014 City files notice of appeal and designation of record on appeal. March 14, 2014 Defendant City files Brief regarding Stay of Case. March 14, 2014 Defendant Hudspeth files Motion for Stay. March 14, 2014 Plaintiffs' file Brief in Partial Opposition to Stay. March 28, 2014 Second Case Management Conference in which Court grants motion to file Amended Answer; Court grants Motion to Stay; Plaintiffs to set Status Conference after receiving Mandate from COA. April 25, 2014 Defendant/Appellant City files Trinity Hearing Exhibits with Trial Court regarding Record on Appeal. May 5, 2014 Trial Court files Certificate of Mailing of Record on Appeal to COA. July 23, 2014: Def/Appellant City files Opening Brief. July 29, 2014, Def/Appellant City files Motion to Supplement Records on

Appeal. August 22, 2014 Court gives notice of Filing Supplemental Record. September 26, 2014, PI/Appellees' file Answer Brief. October 16, 2014 Def/Appellant City files Reply Brief. October 23, 2014 PI/Appellees' Request Oral Argument. April 28, 2015 Oral argument was held. The appeal remains pending in the Court of Appeals.

(Total 121.3 hours – White / Rob Zavaglia at Treece Alfrey Musal, P.C.)

## FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

(CC)

### In RE Banning Lewis Ranch Company, LLC

United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware Chapter 11 Case No. 10-13445 (KJC)

*and*

### In RE Banning Lewis Ranch Development I & II, LLC

United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware Chapter 11 Case No. 10-13446 (KJC) (Jointly administered).

CLAIM: The Banning Lewis Ranch Co. LLC and Banning Lewis Ranch Development I & II LLC, filed Chapter 11 petitions in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in Delaware, citing more than \$242 million in debts. The two companies own the 21,400-acre ranch that stretches from Woodmen Road to Fontaine Boulevard between Marksheffel and Meridian roads.

STATUS: Court approved sale of property to Ultra Resources; action moved to Colorado bankruptcy court to determine whether City land-use agreements including the BLR annexation agreement should remain in effect. On May 1, 2012, the City, Ultra and Debtor BLRC filed a joint motion to hold the adversary proceeding in abeyance until November 1, 2012, while the parties attempt to resolve the matter consensually. July 25, 2012 USBC District of Delaware Court orders the Debtor The Banning Lewis Ranch Company, LLC to sell the 72 acre parcel that was formerly the directors' parcel to Bahr Holdings LLC. Court grants the parties request to hold the Ultra Adversary Proceeding in abeyance until April 1, 2013 and requires the parties to file another status report not later than April 1, 2013. On April 1, 2013, the City and Ultra filed a Second Joint Status Report and Motion for Further Stay of Adversary Proceeding (the "Second Joint Motion"). In the Second Joint Motion, the City and Ultra requested a further stay of all proceedings until July 1, 2013. By order entered on April 3, 2013, the Court granted the Second Joint Motion, stayed the adversary proceeding until July 1, 2013, and directed the parties to file another status report no later than July 1, 2013. On June 28, 2013, the City and Ultra filed a Third Joint Status Report and Motion for Further Stay of Adversary Proceeding (the "Third Joint Motion"). In the Third Joint Motion, the City and Ultra requested a further stay of all proceedings until November 1, 2013. By order entered on July 1, 2013, the Court granted the Third Joint Motion, stayed the adversary proceeding until November 1, 2013, and directed the parties to file another status report no later than November 1, 2013. On November 1, 2013, the City and Ultra filed the Fourth Joint Status Report and Motion For Further Stay Of Adversary Proceeding (the "Fourth Joint Motion"). In the Fourth Joint Motion, the City and Ultra requested a further stay of all proceedings until January 14, 2014. By order entered on November 4, 2013, the Court granted the Fourth Joint Motion, stayed the adversary proceeding until January 14, 2014, and directed the parties to file another status report not later than January 14, 2014. On January 14, 2014, the City and Ultra filed the Fifth Joint Status Report and Motion For Further Stay Of Adversary Proceeding (the "Fifth Joint Motion"). In the Fifth Joint Motion, the City and

Ultra requested a further stay of all proceedings until March 17, 2014. By order entered on January 28, 2014, the Court granted the Fifth Joint Motion, stayed the adversary proceeding until March 17, 2014, and directed the parties to file another status report not later than March 17, 2014. On March 17, 2014, the City filed a Status Report with the Court advising the Court that the parties were unable to reach a consensual resolution and had decided to move forward in the Adversary Proceeding. On March 17, 2014, Ultra and the Debtor filed a Motion to Terminate the Stay of the Adversary Proceeding and Request for a Scheduling Conference. On March 19, 2014, the City filed its Response to the Motion to Terminate the Stay. On March 21, 2014, the Court entered its order terminating the stay of the Adversary Proceedings and (a) directed the parties to file responses to the Motion to Intervene filed by Randle W. Case on or before April 1, 2014; (b) directed Ultra and the Debtor to reply to the City's amended counterclaims by April 17, 2014; (c) directed the parties to conduct a Rule 26(f) conference and submit an amended Rule 26(f) report by April 23, 2014; and (d) scheduled a status and scheduling conference for April 30, 2014. On April 1, 2014, Ultra and the Debtor filed their Response to the Motion to Intervene and stated their opposition to the Motion to Intervene. On April 1, 2014, the City filed its Response to the Motion to Intervene and stated its support for the Motion to Intervene. On April 3, 2014, Ultra and the Debtor filed their Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and argued that the Court should enter a declaratory judgment that the Annexation Agreement is an executory contract that can be rejected. On April 10, 2014, Mr. Case filed his Reply in Support of Motion to Intervene. On April 17, 2014, Ultra and the Debtor filed their Reply to the City's Amended Counterclaims. On April 23, 2014, the parties filed the Amended Rule 26(f) Report. On April 30, 2014, the parties appeared for the status and scheduling conference. During the conference, the Court set a deadline of May 30, 2014, for the City to file its own motion for partial summary judgment and a motion to join necessary parties. The Court also stated that discovery would not go forward until the Court had ruled on the motions for partial summary judgment. On May 5, 2014, Mr. Case filed his Response to Ultra's and the Debtor's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. On May 5, 2014, the City filed its Response to Ultra's and the Debtor's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. On May 30, 2014, the City filed the City's Motion to Require Joinder of Absent Annexors in Banning Lewis Ranch (the "Joinder Motion") and the City's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (the "Summary Judgment Motion"). In the Joinder Motion, the City argued in substance that all of the annexors within Banning Lewis Ranch should be joined as parties to the litigation because Ultra seeks to adversely affect their interests. In the Summary Judgment Motion, the City argued in substance that the Court should grant summary judgment in favor of the City and declare that (a) the Annexation Agreement is not an executory contract that can be rejected pursuant to Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code and (b) the property Ultra acquired from the Debtor remains subject to the Annexation Agreement because the sale of the property to Ultra was not free and clear of the Annexation Agreement pursuant to Section 363(f) of the Bankruptcy Code. On June 2, 2014, Ultra filed its reply brief in support of its motion for partial summary judgment and in reply to the responses filed by the City and Mr. Case to Ultra's motion for partial summary judgment. On June 10, 2014, Nor'wood Development Group issued a press release stating that Ultra had contracted to sell the property to Nor'wood subject to completion of due diligence. On July 7, 2014, Ultra filed its response to the City's Joinder Motion and Summary Judgment Motion. On July 30, 2014, the City filed its reply briefs in further support of the City's Joinder Motion and Summary Judgment Motion and in reply to Ultra's responses in opposition to those motions. On July 31, 2014, the Court set a telephonic status conference to be

held on October 1, 2014, at 10:00 am. On August 26, 2014, the Court entered an order allowing Ultra to file sur-reply briefs in response to the City's reply brief in support of its motion for summary judgment and in support of its motion to join the other annexors as necessary parties. On December 10, 2014, Ultra and the Nor'wood entities that purchased the property within Banning Lewis Ranch owned by Ultra -- BLH No.1, LLC, BLH No. 2, LLC, and Banning Lewis Holdings, LLC (collectively, the "BLH Entities") filed a motion to substitute the BLH Entities for Ultra and stated that Ultra had assigned all of its claims, rights and interests in the adversary proceeding to the BLH Entities. On December 12, 2014, the Court granted the motion to substitute. On December 12, 2014, the Court also heard oral argument on the pending motions for summary judgment and took the matter under advisement. Court's ruling on motions is pending.

(Total 314 hours Massey – Florczak City Attorney's Office / William Hazeltine, Sullivan, Hazeltine, Allison, LLC (Delaware) and Peter Cal at Sherman and Howard (Denver)

BRIDGERS, CANDICE ZAMORA v. THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, by and through its CITY COUNCIL, the governing body for the City of Colorado Springs; KARA SKINNER, Chief Financial Officer for the City of Colorado Springs; MICHAEL SULLIVAN, Human Resource Director; and JOHN DOES 1-3

United States District Court Case Number 14-cv-01483-RM-MJW

CLAIM: Plaintiff claims color/national origin discrimination, hostile work environment and retaliation including termination working in the Finance department with the City of Colorado Springs.

STATUS: Summons and Complaint served June 30, 2014. Responsive pleadings for each defendant are due September 5, 2014. Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint October 20, 2014. Discovery commences. Defendant's filed a partial motion to dismiss on December 3, 2014. January 26, 2015 Plaintiff filed response to motion to dismiss. Discovery cutoff is June 23, 2015. **February 20, 2015 Defendants file reply in support of partial motion to dismiss first amended complaint. March 12, 2015 Magistrate Judge files report and recommendation to grant in part and deny in part Plaintiffs partial motion to dismiss. April 3, 2015 Defendants file written objections to magistrates recommendations. The Court orders dismissal of John Does 1-3.**

(Total 850.95 hours – Lessig/McCall)

#### MEMORIAL HEALTH SYSTEM

Veronica Brtek, a minor, by and through her parents and natural guardians, Sergio De Lourenco and Anne Brtek and Sergio De Lourenco and Anne Brtek, individually v. Douglas W. Smith, N.P., Memorial Health System, Inc. and The City of Colorado Springs

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2014CV32494

CLAIM: Plaintiff claims negligence against Douglas Smith and liability under Colorado Governmental Act against City of Colorado Springs and Memorial Hospital alleging improper treatment at Briargate Urgent Care.

STATUS: Summons and Complaint served September 8, 2014. Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint on December 2, 2014 voluntarily removing all claims against Mr. Smith. Parties are attempting to resolve this matter prior to further litigation.

(Total 1.6 hours – DeLine / Retherford, Mullen & Moore)

Danielle Gore v. David Steinbruner, M.D., City of Colorado Springs – Memorial Hospital and Michael McCann, M.D.

El Paso County District Court Case Number 2014CV30887

CLAIM: Plaintiff claims negligence against Dr. Steinbruner and Memorial Hospital and alleges that due to their negligence Plaintiff suffer damages, losses and permanent impairment.

STATUS: Complaint filed March 19, 2014. Memorial files Answer April 14, 2014. **Eleven day jury trial scheduled to begin October 5, 2015. All fact and expert witnesses have been deposed. The Parties attended a failed Mediation. A second Mediation is scheduled for July 27, 2015.**

(Total \_\_\_ hours – Moore / Retherford, Mullen & Moore)

Kathryn Romstad and Margarethe Bench, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated v. The City of Colorado Springs, a municipal corporation, and in its capacity as a governmental enterprise doing business as Memorial Health System

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2014CV33008

CLAIM: Plaintiffs allege the City of Colorado Springs breached contract and violated the constitution for not following statutory procedure when it leased Memorial Health Systems to UCH.

STATUS: Summons and Amended Complaint served December 5, 2014. December 31, 2014 City files Notice of Filing Notice of Removal and files Notice of Removal in United States District Court. **February 17, 2015 Plaintiffs file second amended complaint. March 10, 2015 City files Motion to Dismiss. March 24, 2015 City files motion to stay discovery on liability until Court's decision on motion to dismiss. April 3, 2015 Plaintiff files response to motion to dismiss. City files reply to its motion to dismiss on April 20, 2015.**

(Total 131.8 hours – White / Gordon Vaughan and David DeMuro of Vaughan & DeMuro)

## MUNICIPAL COURT

Steven Bass v. City of Colorado Springs

El Paso County District Court Case Number 2014M17381

CLAIM: Plaintiff appeals the Court's judgment sentencing him to 160 days in jail for contempt of court claiming disproportionate and abuse of discretion.

STATUS: Notice of Appeal filed July 15, 2014. November 12, 2014 Record for review filed. January 23, 2015 Opening Brief filed. February 6, 2015 Answer brief filed. **March 11, 2015 Appellant files Petition for Rehearing. April 9, 2015 Petition for Certification filed. April 23, 2015 Opposition Brief filed. May 4, 2015 Court orders the record to be filed with the Supreme Court within 21 days.**

(Total 2.7 hours – Curran / Stewart)

## PLANNING

WOODMEN HEIGHTS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT NO. 1, WOODMEN HEIGHTS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT NO. 2, AND WOODMEN HEIGHTS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT NO. 3, TITLE 32 METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS; AND KF 103-CV, LLC, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY v. PRAIRIE VISTA, LLC, A COLORADO

LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; ROCKY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY LAND TRUST, A COLORADO NON-PROFIT CORPORATION; PIKES PEAK HABITAT FOR HUMANITY, INC., A COLORADO NONPROFIT CORPORATION; WILLIAM M. PECK; DARRELL H. OLIVER, SR.; KELLY ANN M. OLIVER; WILLIAM MARCHANT; MAUREEN M. MARCHANT; MARILYN J. HOWELL, AS TRUSTEE OF THE MARILYN J. HOWELL TRUST; C. ARLENE NANCE; SUSAN HANSON; THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, A COLORADO HOME RULE CITY AND MUNICIPAL CORPORATION; AND ALL UNKNOWN PERSONS WHO CLAIM ANY INTEREST IN THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THIS ACTION v. (THIRD PARTY PLAINTIFF) KF 103-CV, LLC, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY v. THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS RS HOLDING COMPANY, LLC, F/K/A INFINITY HOLDING COMPANY, LLC, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; H2 LAND CO, LLC, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; PAUL HOWARD; JONATHAN HOWARD; SCOTT HENTE; AND ROBERT ORMSTON

El Paso County District Court Case NO. 08CV4553

Colorado Court of Appeals Case No. 14CA154

CLAIM: This issue arose between the developers of a subdivision and property owners over the placement of a roadway. Initially, the City was added as a party to this matter as a party in interest. Later, Defendant Peck added City of Colorado Springs on a third amended counterclaim and third party complaint of Defendant William Peck. Peck's only claim against the City was an action for declaratory judgment that the City would approve any restoration plan ordered by the trial court.

STATUS: An Eight Day Trial Commenced October 23, 2012. November 26, 2012 Court issues order stating that City of Colorado Springs must approve court-approved partial restoration plan to Ski Lane and Sopressa Road. Court issues order judgment in favor of the Neighbors (Marchant, Howell, Nance, Hanson Oliver, and Peck) and that all other parties are jointly and severally liable to the Neighbors. December 10, 2012 Neighbors file Motion to Alter or Amend Findings, Conclusions and Judgment. Trial is scheduled for Plaintiff v. Third Party Defendant for January 24, 2013. Court grants stipulation for settlement as to KF 103-CV's Third Party Claims against the Infinity Parties on January 24, 2013. February 8, 2013 Court issues an order pending post-trial motions denying full restoration, that no party obstruct Ski Lane as an access easement, that Nance's motion to impose an order to replace or pay for removed dirt on parties other than RS Construction and Infinity Land is denied, that no recovery costs be passed along, denial of damage awards be reset, Court denies attorney fees, interest will accrue at 8% and in response to WHMD's motion for clarification the Court states that WHMD is jointly liable to partially restore Ski Lane and Sopressa and is not liable for damage awards to neighbors. City has no financial obligations. Parties file proposed orders for final judgment. October 30, 2013 Third Party Defendants file motions for reconsideration of October 15, 2013 Judgment and for order Nunc Pro Tunc concerning motion for clarification re October 15, 2013 Judgment and Motion for Reconsideration re Allocation of Liability of H2 Land Co., et al.; October 31, 2013 Defendants and William Peck file bill of costs. November 14, 2013 Plaintiff/Third-Party Plaintiff files notice of submission of completed construction plans pursuant to Court's order of October 15, 2013. November 15, 2013 KF 103-CV files response in opposition to motion for reconsideration re allocation of liability. November 20, 2013 Third-Party Defendants RS Construction, Hente, and Ormston file response to bill of costs. November 22, 2013 Third Party Defendants file reply in support of their motion for reconsideration re allocation of liability. November 27, 2013 Infinity Land Corp. files joinder in Third-Party

Defendants' response to bill of costs; remaining responsible parties file response and objection to bill of costs. December 3, 2013 Status conference held. December 9, 2013 Defendants Marchants, Howell, and Nancy file combined reply to Defendants' bill of costs and response objecting to the Responsible Parties' proposed interim plans for constructing the Sopresa Lane wall and intersection. December 11, 2013 Court issues orders: 1) granting Hente, Howard, and Ormston's motion seeking clarification that they are not personally liable for judgments in the case and 2) denying Third Party Defendants' motion for order nunc pro tunc concerning motion for clarification re October 15, 2013 judgment and motion for reconsideration re allocation of liability; Third Party Plaintiffs file notice of dismissal of their claims against Third Party Defendants Mulliken & Mulliken, Weiner, Berg, & Jolivet, P.C. December 13, 2013 Plaintiff/Third-Party Plaintiff KF 103-CV files reply in support of its completed construction plans. December 17, 2013 Court issues order approving the construction plans. January 29, 2013 Defendants Marchant, Howell, Nance and Oliver file notice of appeal. June 27, 2013 Appellant files opening brief. July 17, 2014 Colorado Court of Appeals issues ordering show cause as to why the appeal should not be dismissed without prejudice for lack of a final, appealable judgment. July 31, 2014 Plaintiff / Third Party Appellee and Cross Appellants' files response to Court's show cause order. August 7, 2014 Court orders parties to respond if negligent misrepresentation claims of Neighbors against KF 103-CV have been resolved and status of KF 103-CV's and Infinity entities have filed stipulation for dismissal with prejudice; all opening brief and answer brief deadlines are vacated until clarification and resolution of these issues. August 28, 2014 Parties file response to Court's order for show cause. October 6, 2014 Court of Appeals remands issue back to trial court for a limited purpose of making additional findings. Court makes additional findings. Case went back to Court of Appeals. Opening Briefs due February 26, 2015. **March 6, 2015 Parties file answer brief. Appellees Metropolitan Districts 1, 2 and 3 and H2 Land Co, et al file amended answer brief. April 10, 2015 Appellee KF 103-CV files answer brief to Infinity Group's Cross Appeal. May 1, 2015 RS Construction files reply brief. May 4, 2015 Defendant – Appellant's file reply brief.**  
(Total 360.3 hours – White)

## POLICE

RONALD DWAYNE BROWN v. THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS; PETER CAREY, Chief of Police, Colorado Springs Police Department, in his official capacity; VINCE NISKI, Deputy Chief of Police, Colorado Springs Police Department, individually and in his official capacity; ARTHUR "SKIP" ARMS, Commander, Colorado Springs Police Department, individually and in his official capacity; LT. SALVATORE FIORILLO III, Unit Commander, Tactical Enforcement Unit (Swat Team), Colorado Springs Police Department, individually and in his official capacity; SGT. RUSSELL (First Name Unknown), Colorado Springs Police Department, individually and in his official capacity; ; SGT. RONALD SHEPPARD, Colorado Springs Police Department, individually; ; SGT. CHRIS ARSENEAU, Colorado Springs Police Department, individually; ; OFFICER DAN CARTER, Colorado Springs Police Department, individually; OFFICER WILLIAM P. BETTS, Colorado Springs Police Department, individually; OFFICER ROBIN McPIKE, Colorado Springs Police Department, individually; OFFICER SHAWN MAHON, Colorado Springs Police Department, individually; OFFICER VANOONYEN (First Name Unknown), Colorado Springs Police Department, individually and in his official capacity;

United States District Court Case No. 14-cv-01471-RPM

CLAIM: Plaintiff makes multiple claims for relief including violation of 4<sup>th</sup> amendment for excessive force, failure to train or supervise, along with Section 1983 claims and common law claims of negligence, among others.

STATUS: June 3, 2014 Complaint and Summons served. August 5, 2014 City Defendants' file waiver of service of Summons. August 26, 2014 Plaintiff files Amended Complaint and terminates claims against numerous parties. October 6, 2014 The City of Colorado Springs, Chief Peter Carey, Deputy Chief Vince Niski, Lieutenant Salvatore Fiorillo file partial motion to dismiss amended complaint. October 6, 2014 Sergeant Ronald Sheppard, Sergeant Chris Arseneau, Officer Dan Carter, Officer Willaim P. Betts, Officer Robin McPike, Officer Shawn Mahon, and Officer Marcus Van Oonyen file Answer and Affirmative Defenses and Jury Demand to Amended Complaint. October 27, 2014 Plaintiff responds to City's motion to dismiss. October 28, 2014 Court denies partial motion to dismiss amended complaint. November 12, 2014 Defendants file answer to first amended complaint. November 17, 2014 Plaintiff voluntarily dismisses Defendant Arthur "Skip" Arms. January 6, 2014 Court issues scheduling order.

(Total 534.6 hours – Lamphere / White)

People of the State of Colorado v. Robert Crouse

Colorado Court of Appeals Case No. 2012 CA2298

Supreme Court Case No. 2014 SC 109

STATUS: City of Colorado Springs files a motion to either be an added party or in the alternative leave to file an amicus brief. City files amicus brief along with motion. July 26, 2013 Defendant files Answer Brief. August 29, 2013 People file Reply Brief. October 24, 2013 Appellant files notice of supplemental authority. November 20, 2013 Oral argument conducted. December 2, 2013 Parties file post-argument briefs as directed by Court. December 19, 2013 Court of Appeals issues order affirming judgment of trial court that marijuana and marijuana plants should be returned to Crouse. January 31, 2014 Petition of Writ of Certiorari filed by District Attorney on the issue of whether, in a matter of first impression, the court of appeals erred in concluding that the federal Controlled Substances Act does not preempt Article XVIII, section 14(2)(e) of the Colorado Constitution, where the state directive requires law enforcement officers to distribute marijuana to medical marijuana patients in violation of the CSA's prohibition of such acts. February 20, 2014 People file Reply brief.

(Total 86.8 hours – Lamphere)

Guy, Kathryn v. Nathan Jorstad

United States District Court Case No. 12-CV-01249-RM-KMT

CLAIM: Plaintiff claims unnecessary use of excessive force resulting in death.

STATUS: May 15, 2012 Waiver of service of summons and Complaint received. July 9, 2012 Defendants file motion to dismiss. August 14, 2012 Defendants file motion for protective order from discovery and to vacate scheduling order deadlines, which motion is granted; discovery is stayed until the court rules on Defendants' motion to dismiss. November 2, 2012 Court allows Plaintiff to amend complaint; Amended complaint filed. November 16, 2012 Defendants file motion to dismiss Plaintiff's amended complaint. January 23, 2013 Plaintiff files response to City's motion to dismiss. February 6, 2013 Defendants file reply to their motion to dismiss. June 17, 2013 Parties file joint status report. January 27, 2014 Plaintiff filed motion for

order to a finding of Section 15-11-803(7)(1). February 13, 2014 City Defendants file response to Plaintiff's motion for order to a finding of Section 15-11-803(7)(1). April 9, 2014 Court denies Petition pursuant to 15-11-803(7)(1). April 21, 2014 Court grants Defendants Motion to Dismiss; Plaintiff to proceed on claim against Defendant Jorstad in his individual capacity for the alleged violation of the Fourth Amendment; all other Defendants are dismissed. Scheduling conference set for June 3, 2014. May 5, 2014 Defendant Jorstad files Answer to Amended Complaint. June 3, 2014 Scheduling conference held. Court has issued schedule order and three revised scheduling orders issued at Plaintiff's request. **Parties exchange settlement statement. March 31, 2015 City Defendant files motion for summary judgment and brief in support of motion for summary judgment. April 7, 2015 Settlement conference held. No settlement reached. May 8, 2015 Plaintiff files response in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. May 22, 2015 City Defendants file reply to motion for summary judgment.**

(Total 925.35 hours – Turner)

Hampton, Nathaniel v. Officer Evans, Officer Nelson, Officer Cherry, Detective Goodwin, City of Colorado Springs, and Other Unknown Police Officers

United States District Court Case No. 11-cv-01415-RM-CBS

CLAIM: Plaintiff, a pro se prisoner, alleges that on July 6, 2010, officers of the Colorado Springs Police Department conducted an unreasonable strip search and deprived him of his property without due process by auctioning his truck from impound while he was in jail.

STATUS: October 19, 2011 Summons and complaint received. Defendants file successive motions to dismiss. September 26, 2012 Court orders that Plaintiff may file an amended complaint containing claims based on the alleged strip search and a procedural due process claim against the City. December 7, 2012 Plaintiff files his 4<sup>th</sup> amended prisoner complaint. January 14, 2013 Defendants file motion to dismiss Plaintiff's 4<sup>th</sup> amended prisoner complaint. February 6, 2013 Plaintiff files response to Defendants' motion to dismiss 4<sup>th</sup> amended complaint. February 20, 2013 Defendant files reply in further support of its motion to dismiss. April 16, 2013 Magistrate Judge issues recommendation that City's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's Fourth Amended Complaint be granted and to dismiss claims one, three, and five and that the case proceed on claim two against Defendant Evans for violations based on strip search and claim Four against the City based on the notice provided to Mr. Hampton prior to the sale of his truck. May 1, 2013 Plaintiff files objections to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. May 15, 2013 Defendants file response to Plaintiff's objections to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. May 23, 2013 Parties file joint status report to the Court. May 28, 2013 Plaintiff files reply to Defendants' response to objections to magistrate's recommendations. **March 20, 2015 Court files order adopting the recommendation of the magistrate in part and rejecting the recommendation in part. Court grants the dismissal of claims one, three, five and Defendants Cherry, Nelson, Miller, and other unknown officers and dismisses punitive damages against the City. Punitive damages against Evans remain before the Court. March 20, 2015 Plaintiff signs settlement agreement. April 15, 2015 Plaintiff files motion to vacate settlement agreement. April 30, 2015 Defendants file response to motion to vacate settlement agreement. May 15, 2015 Plaintiff files reply to motion to vacate settlement agreement. May 22, 2015 Defendants file sur-reply to motion to vacate settlement agreement.** (Total 452.1 hours – Turner)

Haskett, Phillip David v. Gary Woodrow Flanders, Colorado Springs Police Department Officer Dominick Luna, both personally and in his official capacity, and the Colorado Springs Police Department, a Department of the City of Colorado Springs, Colorado

United States District Court Case No. 13-CV-03392-RBJ-KLM

CLAIM: Plaintiff, who was involved in a civil matter with Defendant Flanders, claims that Officer Luna was negligent in his arrest of Plaintiff following a physical altercation with Mr. Flanders. Claims against City Defendants include malicious prosecution, respondeat superior, and RICO violations.

STATUS: January 9, 2013 Summons and Complaint received. January 29, 2014 City Defendants file motion to dismiss. March 4, 2014 Judge enters order striking Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint as Motion must be entered first. March 11, 2014 Plaintiff files motion for leave to file Amended Complaint. March 17, 2014 Plaintiff files first amended complaint after Court grants order on Plaintiff's motion for leave. Defendant Flanders files joinder in City Defendants motion to dismiss. All Defendants file Motions to Dismiss and have been responded and replied. August 4, 2014 Defendant Flanders files motion to dismiss first amended complaint. August 11, 2014 Plaintiff files response to Defendant Flanders' second motion to dismiss and motion to strike. August 19, 2014 Defendant files reply to second motion to dismiss and motion to strike. September 5, 2014 Plaintiff files motion for leave to file a sur-reply to Defendant Flanders' reply in support of his combined second motion to dismiss and motion to strike. October 24, 2014 Magistrate recommends that Defendant Flanders motion to dismiss first amended complaint be denied. November 24, 2014 Court denies Defendant Flanders motion to dismiss. December 4, 2014 Defendant Flanders files answer to first amended complaint. January 8, 2015 Court grants City Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, only claims against Defendant Flanders remain.

(Total 231.8 hours – Lamphere)

Bryan Koenig v. Terry E. Thurmston, in their individual capacity; Jennene Scott, in their individual capacity; and Jodi Germano, in their individual capacity

United States District Court Case No. 14-cv-01490-RM-MJW

CLAIM: Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated his Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights when arrested in 2012.

STATUS: Summons and Complaint served September 10, 2014. October 1, 2014 City Defendants' file Answer and affirmative defenses. October 29, 2014 Plaintiff files motion for first amended complaint which is granted by Court on October 30, 2014. October 31, 2014 City and County Defendants file joint motion to stay discovery. November 12, 2014 Defendants Thurmston and Scott file motion to dismiss first amended complaint; Defendant Germano also files motion to dismiss plaintiff's amended complaint. January 2, 2015 Plaintiff files combined response to City Defendants Motion to Dismiss and Germano's Motion to Dismiss. Defendant file reply to motion to dismiss. **April 10, 2015 Magistrate files recommendation of Germano's motion to dismiss and City's motion to dismiss both be granted. May 5, 2015 Court enters an order granting City's motion to dismiss, Def Germano's motion to dismiss and dismisses Plaintiff's first amended complaint. Court enters final judgment on May 11, 2015.**

(Total 108.6 hours – White)

Morgan, Larry v. City of Colorado Springs

United States District Court Case No. 15-cv-00185-RPM

CLAIM: Plaintiff alleges discrimination under Title VII based on race, and retaliation for engaging in protected activity.

STATUS: February 5, 2015 Summons and Complaint received via email with Waiver of Service. **April 6, 2015 Defendant files Answer. Scheduling Conference set for May 28, 2015.**

(Total 18.6 hours – McCall)

Ethan Pace v. Blanco Caro, individually and in her official capacity, and the City of Colorado Springs, Colorado

United States District Court Case No. 14-cv-02603-JLK

CLAIM: Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated his Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights claiming unreasonable seizure, deprivation of liberty without due process.

STATUS: Summons and Complaint served October 6, 2014. October 27, 2014 City files Answer and Affirmative Defenses of Blanca Caro to Complaint and Motion to Dismiss Defendant City of Colorado Springs. Response and Reply has been filed. **May 4, 2015 Court denies City's motion to dismiss. Scheduling conference set for June 16, 2015. May 15, 2015 City files answer and affirmative defenses.**

(Total 53.5 hours – White)

The properties 2729 and 2920 N. Prospect Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80907, Justin Kruse, and Two Whole Sailors, a Colorado LLC v. The City of Colorado Springs, A body politic and corporate and a home rule city political subdivision of the State of Colorado; the Colorado Springs Police Department; Officer E. Frederic, CSPD; and all other as yet unidentified police officers involved in the search and seizure here involved

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2014CV33278

CLAIM: Plaintiff brings claim for affirmative injunctive relief to continue existing business and relief of mandamus due to alleged unlawful search and seizure.

STATUS: October 24, 2014 Summons and Emergency Complaint for Relief in the Nature of a Writ of Mandamus pursuant to Rule 106, C.R.C.P.; and for a Mandatory Affirmative Injunction filed by the Plaintiff. October 24, 2014 Court takes no action on the order regarding emergency mandatory affirmative injunction and states to complete service of process and after service is accomplished to set matter for hearing. Defendants file motion to dismiss. Response and reply filed. December 15, 2014 Plaintiffs file an amended emergency complaint for relief along with supplement to the complaint. December 29, 2014 Defendants file answer and affirmative defenses to amended emergency complaint for relief in the nature of a writ of mandamus and for a mandatory affirmative injunction along with response to Plaintiffs' supplement. Court hearing held on Plaintiff's complaint. Court holds that probable cause existed for the search and seizure and denies Plaintiff's motion to return property. **March 17, 2015 Court denies motion to return property.**

(Total 191 hours – Lamphere)

Romens, Alan J. v. City of Colorado Springs

United States District Court Case No. 13-cv-01441-RM-KLM

CLAIM: Plaintiff brings 1983 action claiming violation of Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution stating that sworn marshal positions pay significantly more than his position as a civilian marshal position and require the same duties.

STATUS: September 3, 2013 Summons and Complaint received via mail with Waiver of Service. September 6, 2013 Waiver of Service signed by Christie McCall. September 9, 2013 City files unopposed motion to vacate and reschedule scheduling conference. September 10, 2013 Court grants motion to vacate and resets scheduling conference for November 18, 2013. November 4, 2013 City files motion to dismiss. November 25, 2013 Plaintiff files response to City's motion to dismiss. November 26, 2013 City files unopposed motion for protective order and to vacate scheduling order deadlines. December 3, 2013 Court issues order granting City's unopposed motion for protective order and to vacate scheduling order deadlines, staying all discovery. December 9, 2013 City files reply to its motion to dismiss.  
(Total 178 hours – McCall)

#### REGIONAL BUILDING DEPARTMENT

Probuild Company LLC and BMC West Corporation v. Heritage Homes, INC. d/b/a Today's Homes, INC. a/k/a Today's Homes; Spring Creek Construction, LLC a/d/b/a Springs Creek Construction, LLC; RBC Bank (USA) f/k/a RBC Centura Bank; American Builders Capital (US) INC.; Valiant Trust Company; Integrity Construction LLC; PTL Concrete INC.; Horizon Drywall INC.; Chiddix Brothers, INC.; D.H. Pace Company, INC. d/b/a Ankmar Door; Home Builders Services, INC.; Steel-T Heating, INC.; C&T Plumbing, LLC; Environmental Materials LLC d/b/a Environmental Stoneworks; Creative Touch Interiors, INC.; Positive Electric, LLC; METCO Landscape, INC.; City of Colorado Springs; Safety Rails of Colorado INC.; Builder Services Group, INC. d/b/a Allied Insulation Division 176; The Sherwin-Williams Company; Advanced Ready Mix INC.; Barton Materials, LLC d/b/a Barton Supply; Split Rail Fence CO; Continental Woodworks, Inc.; Sidney C. Shipp; Public Trustee of El Paso County  
El Paso County District Court Case Number 2012CV4089

CLAIM: Plaintiffs filed a mechanic's lien foreclosure based on their furnishing of materials, supplies, and goods for use in or on fourteen properties owned by Heritage Homes, for which they allege payment has not been received. Plaintiffs also allege breach of contract, breach of implied contract, open account, and unjust enrichment. The remaining Defendants, including the City, may have interests in the real properties against which the Plaintiffs seek to foreclose their lien. The City's interest has been identified as extending only to a claim that the properties at issue do not comply with City Code, and this interest has been asserted in the case.

STATUS: December 6, 2012 Summons and Complaint was filed with the City. December 27, 2012 City files answer to Plaintiff's complaint. April 3, 2013 Court grants Plaintiff unopposed and stipulated motion to transfer mechanic's lien action to Division 19 and stay mechanic's lien foreclosure action. **This matter was resolved as part of the MLP Receiverships, LLC, as Receiver; Probuild Company LLC; and PNC Bank, NA v. The City of Colorado Springs, a Colorado home rule city and municipal corporation; and City Council of the City of Colorado Springs in their official capacity settlement.**

(Total 29.8 hours – Gendill)

## TRANSIT SERVICES

Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 19 v. First Transit, Inc., v. City of Colorado Springs  
El Paso County Court Case No. 2007CV1322, appealed to the Colorado Court of Appeals, Case No. 09CA2343;

United States District Court Case No. 10-cv-02002-RPM-MEH;  
Case remanded to Denver District Court Case No. 2010CV6127;  
Case changed venue to El Paso County Court Case No. 2012CV81  
Court of Appeal, Case Number 2013CA001711

**CLAIM:** Defendant and Third-Party Plaintiff First Transit filed this third-party complaint against the City to enforce the City's alleged contractual obligation to indemnify First Transit for any liability and costs arising from the claim of Plaintiff Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 19. In 1981, the City, ATU, and the contract operators for the City's transit operations entered into a Section 13(c) Agreement. In 2006, Laidlaw Transit was awarded the contract to operate the City's general fund transit operations, commonly called the "South Facility." In 2007, the assets of Laidlaw were purchased and merged into First Transit, which assumed Laidlaw's contract with the City. In November, 2009, the City notified First Transit of the termination of the South Services Contract due to funding shortfalls and First Transit was ordered to plan the cessation of the South Facility operation accordingly. First Transit then ceased operating the South Facility and terminated all South Facility employees.

**STATUS:** In January, 2010, ATU asserted to First Transit that First Transit is a party to the Section 13© Agreement and is required by the Agreement to apply the South Facility collective bargaining agreement to the Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority bus transit operation (referred to as the "North Facility") and all North Facility collective bargaining unit employees or to provide dismissal allowances, thereby burdening First Transit with potential liability. ATU filed suit against First Transit in Colorado State District Court for Denver County, Colorado on July 30, 2010. On August 19, 2010, First Transit filed a Notice of Removal in the U.S. District Court, District of Colorado. On September 13, 2010, First Transit filed a third-party complaint against the City seeking indemnification pursuant to the parties' services agreement and alleging that the City is contractually obligated to assume sole responsibility, indemnify, and compensate First Transit for any and all costs and liability resulting from ATU's claims raised pursuant to the 13© Agreement. On November 1, 2010, the City filed a motion to remand to El Paso County District Court. First Transit filed its response to the City's motion to remand on November 23, 2010, and the City replied on December 7, 2010. A hearing on the City's motion to remand was held on January 7, 2011. On February 14, 2012, the Court issued an order granting the City's motion to remand, but remanding the case to the District Court for the City and County of Denver, Colorado. On February 28, 2012, the City filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim for which relief can be granted, C.R.C.P. 12(b)(5) in the District Court for the City and County of Denver, Colorado. On that same date, the District Court for the City and County of Denver, Colorado *sua sponte* issued an order remanding the case to the El Paso County District Court (thereby initiating Case No. 12cv81). On March 1, 2012 ATU filed a motion to reconsider Court's order of February 28, 2012. The City reaffirmed its motion to dismiss by re-filing same in 12cv81. The city responded to ATU's motion to reconsider on March 14, 2012. On March 16, 2012, ATU filed a motion to hold the proceedings in abeyance pending a determination of proper venue. And, on March 19, 2012, ATU filed response to the City's motion to dismiss. On March 20, 2012, First Transit filed a response in opposition to ATU's motion to reconsider the Denver District Court's remand to El Paso County; and, on March 20,

2012 First Transit also responded in support of the City motion to dismiss. ATU replied on March 21, 2012 in support of its motion reconsider the Denver District Court's order remanding to El Paso County. The City then, on March 26, 2012, responded to ATU's motion to hold the proceedings in abeyance. On March 27, 2012 ATU replied to First Transit's response in support of City's motion to dismiss; and ATU replied to First Transit's response regarding the order concerning remand to El Paso County. On March 30, 2012, the City files replied to ATU in support of the City's motion to dismiss. On April 2, 2012, ATU replied in support of its motion to hold proceedings in abeyance. A motions hearing was held on June 21, 2012. On July 6, 2012, the El Paso County District Court (12cv81) issued an order stating it would take no action regarding the City's motion to dismiss until the a judgment was entered in 2007cv1322.

2007cv1322 has been filed by ATU against the City in El Paso County District Court regarding enforcement of the 13(c) agreement against the City and its contractors. In that case, the El Paso County District Court has entered an order on August 25, 2009 entitled Partial Grant and Denial of City's Motion for Summary Judgment, finding the binding interest arbitration provisions of paragraph 15 of the 13(c) agreement in violation of Colorado law and unconstitutional. ATU appealed that ruling to the Colorado Court of Appeals (09CA2343). On October 21, 2010, the Court of Appeals announced an unpublished opinion affirming the judgment and remanding the case with directions. A trial on remand was held June 11, 2012. On July 24, 2012, the Court in 07cv1322 entered an order finding that the 13© agreement was not perpetual and void as a matter of law. 07cv1322 is now closed.

ATU filed a notice of decision on August 28, 2012, notifying the El Paso County District Court in 12cv81 that the Court had ruled in 07cv1322. October 12, 2012 the Court issues order denying City's motion to dismiss in 12cv81. The City on November 8, 2012, filed its answer and affirmative defenses to First Transit's third party complaint. The parties exchanged disclosures on December 18, 2012. Trial is scheduled for September 16, 18 and 19, 2013. The parties have responded to written discovery in advance of the May 31, 2013 discovery cut-off date and dispositive motion deadline of June 17, 2013. May 24, 2013 Court grants stipulation to stay proceedings regarding third party claims. June 17, 2013 First Transit files motion for summary judgment. July 8, 2013 Defendant First Transit files response in opposition to Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment; Plaintiff files brief in opposition to First Transit's motion for summary judgment. July 17, 2013 Plaintiff files amended reply brief in support of its motion for summary judgment. July 24, 2013 Court grants Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and thus agrees to proceed to arbitration; Court denies First Transit's motion for summary judgment. August 28, 2013 First Transit files motion for entry of final judgment pursuant to CRCP 54(b). August 29, 2013 Court grants order for final judgment pursuant to 54 (b). City's liability determination is stayed. September 19, 2013 First Transit files Notice of Appeal. November 21, 2013 First Transit files opening brief. December 3, 2013 First Transit files amended opening brief. January 21, 2014 First Transit responds to Court's Show Cause Order. February 28, 2014 Court files order of dismissal as Court determines it lacks jurisdiction over appeal for lack of final appealable judgment. April 11, 2014 First transit petitions for writ of certiorari from the order of dismissal. April 25, 2014 ATU files Brief in opposition to petition for certiorari. May 2, 2014 First Transit files reply brief in support of petition for writ of certiorari. August 25, 2014 First Transit files motion to lift stay on proceedings re third party claims. August 26, 2014 Amalgamated files objection to First Transit's motion to lift stay. September 10, 2014 First Transit files consolidated reply in support of its motion to lift the stay on proceedings in the third-party claim and response to Plaintiff's ATU's motion to condition the

order lifting the stay of the third-party claim. Court denied First Transit's motion to lift the stay. January 20, 2015 The Colorado Supreme Court denies First Transit's Petition for Writ of Certiorari. The City rejected First Transit's request for settlement negotiations with ATU based on its defenses.

(Total 540.4 hours –Gendill)

## UTILITIES

Robert Alexander in his capacity as Receiver for the Spruce Lodge and Aztec Motel v. Colorado Springs Utilities, an enterprise of the City of Colorado Springs

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2015CV30231

CLAIM: The Plaintiff, who became the Receiver for Spruce and Aztec, paid \$20,000 under protest of past due payments incurred by previous owner and controller Dogged Industries, LLC. Plaintiff requests refund of monies paid and owed to Colorado Springs Utilities in lieu of a Clarifying Order by the Court in case number 2014CV30156.

STATUS: Complaint and Waiver of Service received February 2, 2015. **February 9, 2015 Plaintiff files motion to consolidate actions with 14CV30156 and amended complaint. February 12, 2015 City files waiver and acceptance of service. March 5, 2015 City files motion to dismiss. March 26, 2015 Plaintiff files response to Defendant's motion to dismiss and request for hearing. April 2, 2015 Defendant files reply to its motion to dismiss. Hearing on City's motion to dismiss set for June 11, 2015.**

(Total 67.5 hours – Gendill)

(OC)

CASCADE PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, INC., A COLORADO CORPORATION, AND CASCADE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT NO. 1, A COLORADO SPECIAL DISTRICT AND MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

Pueblo County District Court Water Division No. 2 Case No. 2011CW42

CLAIM: Plaintiffs, Cascade Public Service Company and Cascade Metropolitan District No. 1 allege that the Plaintiffs and the City entered into an agreement as to water rights in 1990. Plaintiffs allege that the City, by its failure to divert, use, and account for use of Plaintiffs' water rights for a period in excess of 20 years has diminished and/or terminated a portion of Plaintiffs' water rights by reducing their historic consumptive use quantification and that this diminishment constitutes a breach of the 1990 agreement. Plaintiffs were granted leave to amend their complaint to add a new claim for relief that the City had breached the 1990 Agreement by its alleged failure to keep accurate records and accounts of water service and to correct within a reasonable time errors in billing. Plaintiffs seek declaratory judgment by the Court that the City did breach the 1990 Agreement with the result that the Bypass Flow Obligation is in full force and effect.

STATUS: June 24, 2011 – summons and complaint received. July 21, 2011 – City files its answer. In June 2012, Plaintiffs were granted leave to amend their complaint to add a new claim for relief that the City had breached the 1990 Agreement by its alleged failure to keep accurate records and accounts of water service and to correct within a reasonable time errors in billing. The City filed its answer to the amended complaint on July 11, 2012 and asserted a breach of contract counterclaim against the Plaintiffs for their failure to pay for water service within the time required by the 1990 Agreement. Trial was originally scheduled for April 2013. In

February 2013, Plaintiffs hired additional legal counsel and due to the schedule of the new counsel, the April 2013 trial date was vacated and reset for August 13-16, 2013. The parties subsequently entered into settlement discussions and in late April, agreed to hold in abeyance all further trial preparation while settlement negotiations proceeded. Plaintiffs filed a motion to vacate the trial to allow settlement negotiations to proceed. The parties discussed settlement on a number of occasions, but they were unable to reach a settlement. Trial was then scheduled for February 11-14, 2014. In November 2012, Cascade Public Service Company gave a deed in lieu of foreclosure to Realty Management Group, LLC (RMG) conveying the Harmes Ditch Water Rights that are the subject of the 1990 Agreement. On October 31, 2013, RMG moved to intervene in the case as a Plaintiff on the grounds that it owns the Harmes Ditch Water rights. The City consented to intervention on the grounds that RMG now owned the water rights and the court granted the motion to intervene. Plaintiffs filed a motion to continue trial on the grounds that one of Plaintiffs' key witnesses was under criminal investigation for embezzlement from the Cascade Metropolitan District and was not available for deposition or trial until after the criminal charges were resolved. The City opposed the motion due to prejudice to the City arising from delay and continued non-payment for water services by the Plaintiffs. The City and Plaintiffs thereafter entered into an agreement to continue the trial pursuant to which the Cascade Metropolitan District will add a monthly fee to its current water bills and use the money from the added fee to pay off its past-due balance. In addition, Plaintiffs agreed to pay in full each monthly bill plus all accrued interest. If Plaintiffs fail to adhere to this agreement, then trial could be reset without regard to the status of Plaintiffs' unavailable witness. The parties are required to file status reports with the court on the availability of the currently unavailable witness in June 2014 and every 91 days thereafter. Trial will be rescheduled as soon as the unavailable witness can testify, but when the witness will be available is still unknown due to investigations still underway by the El Paso County District Attorney's office. There are several other motions pending before the court seeking rulings on various matters. The parties have met on several occasions to discuss settlement and those discussions are continuing. A status conference was held with the court on July 7, 2014. At that time the court ordered the parties to enter into mediation. The parties agreed to use retired water judge O. John Kuenhold as the mediator. Subsequent to the court's order for mediation, a group of customers of the Cascade metropolitan District moved to intervene in the lawsuit. The customers of the Cascade metropolitan District are located outside of the District's boundaries and therefore have no vote on the District's Board of Directors. They think the District has been badly managed and feared any settlement would occur to their detriment. Because their interests were not represented by any party to the lawsuit, they appeared entitled to intervene, so the City consented to their intervention, as did the Plaintiffs. The Intervenors were included in the court ordered mediation. As a result of the mediation the parties reached an agreement in principle on settlement of the lawsuit. **The settlement agreement was presented to and approved by the Utilities Board and City Council. An initial closing to effect the settlement was held on April 3, 2015. A final closing is to be held by early June. The lawsuit was dismissed with prejudice on April 3, 2015.** (William Paddock at Carlson, Hammond & Paddock)

Chiddix Excavating, Inc., a Colorado Corporation v. Colorado Springs Utilities a subsidiary of City of Colorado Springs; and City of Colorado Springs, a Municipal Corporation

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2014CV34137

United States District Court Case No. 14-cv-0335

CLAIM: Plaintiff, an excavating company, claims after City wrongfully revoked Chiddix's license and violated Plaintiff's due process rights, took property without just compensation, deprived Plaintiff of private property among other claims.

STATUS: Summons and Complaint served November 18, 2014. December 9, 2014 City files Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Jury Demand. December 11, 2014 City files notice of Removal to United States District Court. December 19, 2014 El Paso County Court orders Removal and closes case. Settlement Conference scheduled for February 26, 2015. **Five day jury trial is set to commence on March 7, 2016. Discovery commences.**

(Total 241.2 hours – Lamphere)

(CC)

City of Colorado Springs, Colorado v. Lorson, LLC, a Colorado Limited Liability Company, as nominee for Murray Fountain, LLC, a Colorado Limited Liability Company. And as nominee for Lorson Conservation Investment 2, LLLP, a Colorado limited liability limited partnership; Widefield Water and Sanitation District, a quasi-municipal corporation of the State of Colorado; and Robert C. Balink, El Paso County Treasurer

El Paso County Combined Court Case No. 2013CV032113.

CLAIM: The City filed this action in order to acquire a certain right-of-way in the form of permanent and temporary construction easements by eminent domain for the completion of the Southern Delivery System. The City requests that the Court determine the compensation to be paid Respondents for the interests in the subject property and that the City have judgment condemning the property upon compensation by the City to the Respondents.

STATUS: December 6, 2013 City files Petition in Condemnation. December 9, 2013 City files motion for immediate possession. December 10, 2013 City files Notice of Commencement of Action – Lis Pendens. December 31, 2013 Defendant Balink files disclaimer of interest. February 4, 2014 Order for Immediate Possession granted. Status report due July 16, 2014. September 11, 2014 Parties propose commissioners. October 9, 2014 Court appoints commissioners. January 26, 2015 Respondents file Motion for determinations of law. **February 13, 2015 Petitioner files response to Motion for determinations of law. February 23, 2015 Reply to response to motion for determination so flaw. February 26, 2015 Court files order on Lorson's Motion for determinations of law that finds the City of Colorado Springs does have authority to condemn and is exempt from C.R.S. 38-1-122(1.5) in this case.**

(Total 92.5 hours – Turner/Blieszner/Banner)

City and County of Denver; and City of Colorado Springs by and through its enterprise, Colorado Springs Utilities v. Solid and Hazardous Waste Commission

Denver District Court Case No. 2014CV34158

CLAIM: Plaintiffs' claim that Defendants exceeded the scope of its authority and that action is arbitrary and capricious and contrary to constitutional right relating to regulations of disposal of solid waste.

STATUS: Plaintiffs files Complaint October 31, 2014. November 14, 2014 Answer received for Colorado Solid and Hazardous Waste Commission. November 17, 2014 Plaintiff's file First Amended Complaint for Judicial Review of Agency Action. On January 1, 2005, Plaintiffs filed their administrative record for appeal. **Defendant filed certificate of record on March 13, 2015. Plaintiff files Opening brief on April 10, 2015. Defendant files its Answer brief on May 8, 2015. Plaintiffs have until May 22, 2015 to file their Reply brief. Oral arguments will be scheduled.**

(Total 48.5 hours – Griffith)

(CC)

CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, CO v. ULTRA RESOURCES, INC, a Wyoming Corporation and ROBERT C. BALINK, El Paso County Treasurer.

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2013CV743

CLAIM: The City filed this action in order to acquire land in fee simple and a certain right-of-way in the form of permanent and temporary construction easements by eminent domain for the completion of the Southern Delivery System. The City requests that the Court determine the compensation to be paid Respondents for the interests in the subject property and that the City have judgment condemning the property upon compensation by the City to the Respondents.

STATUS: January 23, 2013 Petition in Condemnation and Motion for Immediate Possession. January 24, 2013 Notice of Lis Pendens recorded with the El Paso County Clerk & Recorder. March 8, 2013 Ultra Resources files response in opposition to motion for immediate possession. March 13, 2013 Petitioner files brief in support of motion for immediate possession. March 19-20, 2013 Immediate possession hearing held. March 20, 2013 Court grants order for immediate possession. August 28, 2013 Motion for leave to file amended petition. September 23, 2013 Court grants leave to file amended petition. Status Conference held October 28, 2013; Order issued granting second motion for immediate possession. December 9, 2013 Parties file partial joint nomination of commissioners, nominating two commissioners (Steve Pelican and Edwards Shields, and request for additional time to complete nomination). December 13, 2013 Parties file joint nomination of final commissioner (Kirk Samelson). December 16, 2013 Court issues order granting the nomination of the commissioners. Four day trial to commission set for February 9, 2015. Mediation scheduled for August 28, 2014. November 21, 2014 Petitioner's file motion for leave to file second amended petition. December 5, 2014 Court grants order to continue trial. **February 24, 2015 Respondents Banning Lewis Holdings file motion to compel discovery responses. Court denies motion to compel. March 17, 2015 City files response to motion to compel. March 24, 2015 Respondents file reply to motion to compel. May 7, 2015 Court denies Respondents' motion to compel.**

(Total 129.75 hours – Turner / Blieszner)

(CC)

CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO v. WALKER RANCHES, LLP, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; AND DEL OLIVAS, PUEBLO COUNTY TREASURER

Pueblo County Combined Court Case No. 2011CV313.

Colorado Supreme Court Case No. 2014SA319

CLAIM: The City filed this action in order to acquire a certain right-of-way in the form of a permanent easement and a temporary construction easement by eminent domain for the completion of the Southern Delivery System. The City requests that the Court determine the compensation to be paid Respondents for the interests in the subject property and that the City have judgment condemning the property upon compensation by the City to the Respondents.

STATUS: May 11, 2011 City files Petition in Condemnation. May 26, 2011 Pueblo County Treasurer files answer to petition in condemnation and notice of claim for prorated property taxes for the current taxable year on property. May 31, 2011 Walker Ranches files answer to petition in condemnation and jury demand and response to motion for immediate

possession. October 11, 2011 Parties file stipulation for immediate possession. October 11, 2011 Court issues order granting immediate possession; City to deposit \$76,046.00 into court registry; Cattle Relocation Agreement previously entered into between the City and Walker Ranches incorporated into this agreement; Walker Ranches will have 90 days from date of deposit of funds into court registry to obtain appraisal at City's expense. October 18, 2011 City files notice of deposit of funds in court registry. November 29, 2011 Walker Ranches files motion for forthwith disbursement of funds on deposit in the District Court Registry. November 30, 2011 Court issues order granting motion for forthwith disbursement of funds on deposit in the District Court Registry. December 9, 2011 Defendant Olivas files disclaimer of interest. February 8, 2012 Petitioner files unopposed motion for leave to file amended petition. February 9, 2012 Court grants Petitioner's motion for leave to file amended petition. June 4, 2012 Court issues Pre-Trial Order outlining deadlines prior to trial. Four-day jury trial rescheduled from May 14, 2013 to February 18, 2014. October 10, 2013 Parties file Proposed Stipulated Modified Case Management Order. October 21, 2013 Court grants Parties' Stipulated Amended Modified Case Management Order. October 24, 2013 Order granting Petitioner's motion for leave to file second amended petition in condemnation. October 30, 2013 Parties file stipulation for immediate possession. Discovery has commenced. November 4, 2013 Order granting immediate possession. November 18, 2013 City files motion to reschedule trial and enlarge time to file rebuttal expert reports. November 21, 2013 Respondent files motion for forthwith disbursement of additional funds on deposit in the District Court Registry and response to the City's motion to reschedule the trial and enlarge time to file rebuttal expert reports. November 27, 2013 City files reply to its motion to reschedule trial and enlarge time to file rebuttal expert reports. December 10, 2013 Court issues order granting City's motion to reschedule trial and enlarge time to file rebuttal expert reports. December 16, 2013 Court issues order granting motion for forthwith disbursement of additional funds on deposit in the District Court registry. April 16, 2014 Petitioner files motion to compel disclosure of respondent's financial information relating to ranching operations. Hearing scheduled for June 18, 2014. August 26, 2014 Walker Ranches files motion in limine to exclude expert opinions based on assumptions now known to be false. August 28, 2014 Petitioner files motion to reschedule trial and request for expedited disposition. September 2, 2014 Court denies Walker Ranches motion in limine; Court also denies the motion to reschedule trial. September 9, 2014 Petitioner files motion for jury view of the property. Numerous depositions scheduled. September 15, 2014 Petitioner files several motions in limine. October 11, 2014 Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order approved by Court. October 12, 2014 Court denies and rules on Petitioner's motions in limine. October 15, 2014 Petitioner files Petition for Rule to Show Cause with Supreme Court; Petitioner files Status Report regarding document production to District Court. October 16, 2014 Court orders that Walker Ranches respond in 7 days as the Court feels there is no practical way to produce material before trial. Mediation scheduled for September 29, 2014. Trial scheduled for November 4, 2014 was vacated on October 19, 2014 by Court; a new trial is to be set on November 4, 2014. October 23, 2014 Colorado Supreme Court denies Petition for Rule to Show Cause. November 25, 2014 Court orders hearing on MWH Global's response to motion to show cause. Walker Ranches files Motion for costs which has been responded and replied to and awaiting Court decision. December 4, 2014 Court grants Respondent's motion for costs in the amount of \$387,065.90. Two-week jury trial scheduled to begin April 13, 2015. Hearing on pending discovery matters scheduled for January 16, 2015. Pre-trial readiness conference scheduled for March 23, 2015. City files with the Supreme Court petition for rule to show cause.

December 22, 2014 Respondent files motion to partially lift stay. December 31, 2014 Petitioner the City files response to Respondent Walker Ranches' motion to partially lift stay. January 5, 2015 Respondent Walker Ranches files response to the rule to show cause. January 6, 2015 Court denies Walker Ranches motion to partially lift stay. Matter is set for half-day hearing March 2, 2015 for pending motions and discovery matters. January 26, 2015 Petitioner files reply in support of rule to show cause. February 6, 2015 Colorado Supreme Court grants rule to show cause and vacates district court's December 4, 2014 order granting Respondent's motion for costs. **April 6, 2015 Petitioner and Respondent files trial briefs. April 13-23, 2015 Trial held. Jury verdict: \$82,900 for the easements acquired and \$4,665,000 as damages to the remainder. May 7, 2015 City files notice of appeal. May 14, 2015 Respondent files bill of costs, notice of conditional cross-appeal, and motion for attorney fees.**

(Total 405.4 hours – Turner/Blieszner/Banner/Robbins)

Cusack, Mark E. v. Daniela Francis Cusack a/k/a Daniela F. Cusack; The City of Colorado Springs, a municipal corporation; and all unknown persons who may claim any interest in the subject matter of this action

El Paso County District Court Case No. 2013CV32158.

CLAIM: Plaintiff seeks declaratory judgment in this matter and a determination of adverse possession, alleging that he is entitled to a decree vesting title in the subject property to him. Plaintiff also seeks as declaratory judgment that a Warranty Deed conveying an interest in the property to the City in 1973 was for an easement only and not for a fee interest, as claimed by the City.

STATUS: December 18, 2013 Summons and Complaint received. January 8, 2014 City files answer and counterclaim, asking the Court to deny Plaintiff's claims, declare that the City owns the tract of land that is the subject matter of this matter, that no other person has an enforceable interest in the subject property, and enter judgment to the subject property in favor of the City. The City seeks a declaration that, via the Warranty Deed, the City received fee simple title to the subject property for the purpose of maintaining water transmission lines and incidental uses, including maintaining roads. January 20, 2014 Plaintiff files reply to City's counterclaim and notice of lis pendens recorded December 10, 2013. February 3, 2014 Plaintiff files reply to Defendant Daniela Cusack's counterclaim. Defendant Daniela Cusack filed answer and counterclaim against Plaintiff Mark Cusack. Discovery commences. Five day jury trial scheduled for May 11, 2015. Mediation is scheduled for August 29, 2014. Parties have reached a tentative agreement. Settlement documents are not final at this time.

(Total 260.05 hours – Gendill)

Gumaer Placer, LLC, a Colorado limited liability company v. City of Colorado Springs, a Colorado municipality

Park County District Court Case No. 2014CV30019

CLAIM: Plaintiff brings a declaratory judgment action based upon a right of way agreement of 1955 for the City's alleged refusal to move a raw water underground pipeline to allow for future mining operations in Alma, CO.

STATUS: Waiver and Complaint received March 11, 2014. March 19, 2014 Waiver and Acceptance of Service. April 9, 2014 City files Motion to Dismiss. April 28, 2014 Plaintiff files response to City's motion to dismiss. May 5, 2014 Defendant files reply in further support of Motion to Dismiss. May 7, 2014 Court grants motion to dismiss, but allows Plaintiff to file

amended complaint within 30 days. June 4, 2014 Plaintiff files amended complaint for declaratory judgment. June 18, 2014 City files motion to dismiss. July 23, 2014 Plaintiff files response to second motion to dismiss. August 12, 2014 City files reply brief in further support of Defendant's motion to dismiss amended complaint. October 7, 2014 Court denies motion to dismiss amended complaint and orders that the parties engage in mediation. November 3, 2014 City files Answer to Amended Complaint. January 16, 2015 Court enters stipulated initial case management order and stipulated protective order. **Discovery commences.**  
(Total 206.2 hours – Turner)

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION AND REQUEST OF THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS FOR AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH A NEW PUBLIC CROSSING AND IMPROVED APPROACH AT THE CROSSING OF THE EXISTING TRACKS LOCATED NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF LOREN LANE AND INTERSTATE 25, IN EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado Docket No. 13A-1104R

APPLICATION: The City applies to the Public Utilities Commission for authorization to establish a new public railway crossing and improve approach at the intersection of Loren Lane and railroad tracks.

STATUS: October 21, 2013 City files notice of application and petition. October 29, 2013 PUC issues a 30-day notice to interested parties to file Notice of Intervention. November 26, 2013 BNSF Railway Company files entry of appearance and notice of intervention. December 11, 2013 Public Utilities Commission issues decision deeming application complete and granting application, subject to completion of a construction and maintenance agreement between Utilities and BNSF Railway Company.

(Total \_\_ hours – Burgess).

(OC)

NEW YORK STATE ET AL. UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY AND STEPHEN L. JOHNSON, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, United States District Court, Southern District of New York, Case Nos. 08-cv-5606 and 08-cv-8430 – challenges to EPA's Water Transfers Rule filed in US District Court at the same time as challenges were filed in multiple courts of appeal (see above). November 14, 2012, after Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals rules it does not have jurisdiction over the challenges to the Rule, Judge extends stay to December 17, 2012 without prejudice to intervention and sets briefing schedule. December 6, 2012, Western Urban Water Coalition *et al.* (including the City of Colorado Springs acting by and through Colorado Springs Utilities) "Western Providers", files pre-motion letter requesting conference on intervention as defendants. Colorado/New Mexico *et al.*, Friends of the Everglades, Miccosukee Tribe, South Florida Water Management District file similar letters on intervention by end of December. December 27 Judge extends stay and sets pre-motion conference. January 30, 2013, Judge holds pre-motion conference on intervention in White Plains, New York; intervention granted to all by consent at conclusion of conference. Per Judge's briefing schedule: Motion(s) to dismiss by EPA and Defendant-Intervenor South Florida Water Management District, and Plaintiffs' motions for summary judgment filed March 22, 2013; EPA and Defendant-Intervenors responses and cross-motions for summary judgment filed June 7, 2013; Plaintiff's responses/replies filed July 7, 2013; EPA and

Defendant-Intervenors replies filed August 2, 2013. December 19, 2013 oral argument on cross motions for summary judgment scheduled held in White Plains, NY. March 28, 2014 Judge grants Plaintiffs' and Intervenor- Plaintiffs' Motions for Summary Judgment, denies Defendants' and Intervenor- Defendants' Motions and Cross-motions for Summary Judgment, vacates the Water Transfers Rule to the extent it is inconsistent with the statute and in particular the phrase "navigable waters" as interpreted in Rapanos and in the Opinion, and remands the Water Transfers Rule to the extent EPA did not provide a reasoned explanation for its interpretation. May 30, 2014, Western Providers, Western States, EPA and other inventor-defendants file notices of appeal. September 9-15, 2014 Western Providers and other appellants file opening briefs. December 24, 2014 Appellees to file responsive briefs. January 6, 2015 all parties request oral argument. January 26, 2015 Appellants file reply briefs. **April 2015 the Court has indicated it is likely to schedule oral argument for late August or early September.**

(Peter D. Nichols)

ONRC ACTION v. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (BOR), COMMISSIONER OF THE BOR; KLAMATH BASIN WATER USERS ASSN.; OREGON WATER RESOURCES CONGRESS; KLAMATH DRAINAGE DISTRICT

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, on appeal from United States District Court for the District of Oregon, Appeal No. 12-35831

CLAIM: Citizen lawsuit against Reclamation for water transfers through Klamath Straights without an NPDES permit.

STATUS: October 12, 2012, ONRC Action appeals the District of Oregon's Order of August 14, 2012, adopting the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation granting defendant's motion for summary judgment and dismissing ONRC's lawsuit. May 8, 2014, briefing on appeal complete. Amicus curiae briefs filed by the Hoopa Valley Tribe the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, Friends of the Everglades, and Florida Wildlife Federation, and by the States of New York et al. ("Eastern States") in support of ONRC. Western Urban Water Coalition, National Water Resources Association et al. (including the City of Colorado Springs acting by and through Colorado Springs Utilities) ("Western Providers"), the States of Colorado/New Mexico et al. ("Western States"), the State of California by and through The California Department of Water Resources, and Westlands Water District and San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority file amicus curiae briefs in support of Reclamation. November 21, 2014, oral argument held in Portland, Oregon.

(Peter D. Nichols)

## ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION

### DISPOSED MATTERS

### NEW MATTERS

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01282.

Claimant brings charge of alleged discrimination based on the ADA and Title VII filed on March 31, 2015. Position statement / RFI due June 8, 2015.

(Total \_\_ hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01278.

Claimant brings charge of alleged discrimination based on the ADA and Title VII filed on April 6, 2015. Waiting on perfected charge.

(Total 4.2 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01430.

Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on April 21, 2015. Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.

(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01056.

Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 2, 2015. Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.

(Total 6.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01060.

Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 3, 2015. Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.

(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01115.

Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 10, 2015. Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.

(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01123.

Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 13, 2015. Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.

(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01141.

Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 16, 2015. Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.

(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01180.

Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 19, 2015. Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.

(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01124.

Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 17, 2015. Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.

(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01143.  
Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 16, 2015.  
Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.  
(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01138.  
Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 17, 2015.  
Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.  
(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01132.  
Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 17, 2015.  
Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.  
(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-01165.  
Claimant brings charge of alleged gender and age discrimination filed on March 19, 2015.  
Position Statement/RFI due June 26, 2015.  
(Total 5.3 hours – Lessig / McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number E20150415.  
Claimant brings charge of alleged ADA discrimination filed on March 16, 2015. Position Statement/RFI filed May 15, 2015. Waiting for response from CCRD.  
(Total 4.6 hours – Lessig / McCall)

## CURRENT MATTERS

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-00120.  
Claimant brings charge of alleged age discrimination and ADA discrimination on December 10, 2014. Position Statement/RFI filed February 6, 2015. Waiting for response from EEOC.  
(Total 102.2 hours – McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-00766.  
January 28, 2015 Claimant brings charge of discrimination based on Title VII. Waiting on perfected charge.  
(Total 52.35 hours – McCall)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2014-02154.  
Claimant brings charge of alleged age discrimination on September 26, 2014. Position Statement/RFI filed December 12, 2014. **Received Dismissal and Notice of Right to Sue; deadline for filing a lawsuit if May 27, 2015.**  
(Total 122.1 hours – Lessig)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2014-02239.  
Claimant brings charge of alleged age discrimination on October 10, 2014. Position Statement/RFI filed December 22, 2014.

(Total 62.1 hours –Lessig)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, Charge Number 541-2015-00306.

Claimant brings a continuing action claim of discrimination based on retaliation and sex on October 31, 2014. Position Statement / RFI filed January 22, 2015.

(Total 138.4 hours – Lessig)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EEOC Charge No. 541-2014-01062. Charging Party alleges discrimination on the basis of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Mediation held December 16, 2014. **City’s Position Statement / RFI filed March 4, 2015. Waiting on response from the EEOC.**

(Total 83.7 hours – Lessig)

EMPLOYEE V. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EEOC Charge No. 541-2014-01161. *See EEOC Charge No. 541-2014-00190.* Charging Party alleges discrimination and retaliation on the basis of gender in violation of the Equal Pay Act and Title VII. Position Statement/RFI filed July 28, 2014. Dismissal and Notice of Rights issued by the EEOC February 4, 2015. The deadline to file lawsuit under Title VII is May 5, 2015; under the EPA is August 26, 2015.

(Total 145.35 hours – McCall)

EMPLOYEE v. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EEOC Charge No. 541-2014-00190. Charging Party filed Notice of Discrimination on November 6, 2013, and filed the perfected charge December 2, 2013, alleging discrimination under Title VII and violations of the Equal Pay Act. Position Statement/RFI filed January 17, 2014. Dismissal and Notice of Rights issued by the EEOC February 4, 2015. The deadline to file lawsuit under Title VII is May 5, 2015; under the EPA is August 26, 2015.

(Total 162 hours – McCall)

EMPLOYEE v. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EEOC Charge No. 541-2014-00410. Charging Party filed Notice of Discrimination December 4, 2013, alleging discrimination and retaliation under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Position statement /RFI filed April 4, 2014. Waiting for decision from EEOC.

(Total 129 hours – McCall)

EMPLOYEE v. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EEOC Charge No. 541-2013-01723. Charging Party files second Notice of Discrimination based on ADA discrimination. Position Statements filed August 16, 2013. **Received Dismissal and Notice of Right to Sue; deadline to file a lawsuit is July 15, 2015.**

(Total 211.8 hours – Lessig)

EMPLOYEE v. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EEOC Charge No. 541-2013-01504. Notice of Charge of ADA Discrimination is filed May 22, 2013. May 29, 2013 Charging Party alleges discrimination based on disability and retaliation. Position Statements filed August 16, 2013. **Received Dismissal and Notice of Right to Sue; deadline to file a lawsuit is July 15, 2015.**

(Total 103.25 hours - Lessig)

EMPLOYEE v. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EEOC Charge No. 541-2013-02295. September 17, 2013 Charging Party alleges Title VII discrimination on the basis of race and color. Position statements and request for information filed. Waiting for decision from EEOC.

(Total 133 hours – McCall)

EMPLOYEE v. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EEOC Charge No. 541-2013-02323. Charging Party filed the charge of discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, claiming discrimination based on her gender, as well as retaliation. Position Statement and RFI extended to January 6, 2014. Position Statement and Response to Request for Information filed January 6, 2014. Waiting for decision from EEOC.

(Total 106.7 hours – Lessig).

EMPLOYEE v. CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, EEOC Charge No. 541-2014-00026. Charging Party filed the charge of discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, claiming discrimination based on his national origin, as well as retaliation. Position Statement and RFI extended to January 6, 2014. Position Statement and Response to Request for Information filed January 6, 2014. December 3, 2014 Charging Party files amended charge of discrimination. Position Statement / RFI in response to Amended Charge filed January 30, 2015. Waiting decision from the EEOC.

(Total 169.9 hours – McCall / Lessig).

**Total Active Application Cases: 10 ( 2 Diligence cases)**

<b><u>Number</u></b>	<b><u>Case Name</u></b>
05CW96	Leased Water Exchange
06CW120	ROY Exchange Application
07CW122	Pueblo Reservoir and Williams Creek Reservoir
12CW31	Upper Williams Creek Reservoir
13CW9	Arkansas River Exchange (Diligence)
13CW3077	Green Mountain Reservoir
13CW3001	Chilcott Ditch Company
13CW3002	Fountain Mutual Irrigation Company
15CW3008	Bear Creek Intake
15CW3019	Blue River (Diligence)

**Application Cases Before Water Referee: 4**  
**Application Cases Before Water Judge: 6**

**Total Objector Cases: 44**

**Active 29**  
**Stipulated 15**

**Active Before Water Referee: 28**  
**Active Before Water Judge: 16**

<b><u>Number</u></b>	<b><u>Case Name</u></b>
98CW173	Lake County Board of County Commissioners
98CW174	City of Cripple Creek
05CW107(B)	City of Lamar
06CW8	Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District
07CW127	Colorado Water Protective & Development Association
07CW128	Colorado Water Protective & Development Association
08CW12	Booth Well Association
10CW4	Lower Arkansas Valley Water
11CW3	Shane, Gary, et al.
11CW13	City of La Junta
11CW77	Lower Arkansas Valley Water & Larkspur, Inc.
12CW94	Catlin Augmentation
12CW124	Climax Molybdenum Company
12CW125	United States of America and Park Center Water District
12CW176	Climax Molybdenum Company
13CW7	Town of Fowler

**WORKERS COMPENSATION MATTERS OUTSIDE COUNSEL**

**Active cases:**

Municipal – 31  
Utilities – 10  
Memorial - 2

**Subrogation cases** handled by outside counsel:

Municipal – 0  
Utilities – 0

**Subrogation cases** handled by City Attorney's Office:

Municipal – 3  
Utilities – 2

**HOSPITAL COLLECTION MATTERS**

**350** *filed in February 2015*

Credit Service Company – 162  
BC Services – 188

**319** *filed in March 2015*

Credit Service Company – 168  
BC Services – 151

**243** *filed in April 2015*

Credit Service Company – 198  
BC Services – 45

**CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS SECTION**

(MUNICIPAL COURT)

	<u>FEBRUARY</u>	<u>MARCH</u>	<u>APRIL</u>
Cases Docketed for Trial by Court	454	580	512
Cases tried:	202	237	278
Cases handled without trial:	252	343	234
Cases Docketed for Trial by Jury:	20	15	5
Cases tried:	4	1	0
Cases handled without trial:	16	14	5
Cases Handled on Deferred Docket:	163	161	141
Cases Handled at Pretrial:	551	549	607
Cases Handled at Arraignments:	945	1374	1620
Mailed Dispositions:	7	14	74
Deferred Sentences at Arraignment:	1	16	3
Criminal Arraignments Screened:	571	677	748
Jail Docket:	379	530	522
Liquor Hearings:	4	3	1
NPOI:	1011	1488	245
Good Driver Letters Mailed:	655	878	990
TOTAL MATTERS:	3497	4344	4791