

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING IN DISCIPLINE Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline	
IN RE: COMPLAINANT, Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline, and RESPONDENT, Sean K. Murphy.	
Attorney for Respondent Nathan Bruggeman, #39621 David M. Beller, #35767 RECHT KORNFELD, P.C. 1600 Stout Street Suite 1400 Denver, CO 80202 (303) 573-1900 nate@rklawpc.com david@rklawpc.com	▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲ Case No. 25-185 (Supreme Court Case No. 2025SA317)
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME TO ANSWER COMPLAINT	

Respondent, Sean K. Murphy, through his counsel, Nathan Bruggeman and David Beller of Recht Kornfeld, P.C., hereby submits this motion for an additional extension of time to answer the complaint, and in support states as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERRAL

Undersigned counsel has conferred with counsel for the Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline (“Commission”), Jeffrey Walsh, and the Commission does not oppose this motion.

MOTION

1. On November 20, 2025, the Adjudicative Judicial Discipline Panel (“Panel”) entered an order establishing December 1, 2025, as the deadline for the filing of Judge Murphy’s answer.

2. Since the filing of Judge Murphy’s initial motion to establish an answer deadline,¹ the parties have initiated discussions over a potential resolution of this matter.

3. Judge Murphy also notes that the current answer deadline falls immediately after the Thanksgiving holiday week, and various interested parties are traveling for the holiday.

4. In light of the resolution discussions, the parties agree that the interests of efficiency and judicial economy support a modest extension of the answer deadline to December 14, 2025.

5. Good cause supports this extension. First, as noted, considerations of efficiency and judicial economy support providing the parties with additional time for their discussions. The additional time will allow the parties to focus on achieving a negotiated resolution, which they believe is in the best interests of all parties and the public.

6. Second, no party will be prejudiced by this request, as evidenced by the Commission’s concurrence with this request.

7. Third, the requested extension will not materially delay resolution of this case. Judge Murphy is requesting only a modest amount of time, two (2) weeks. If the parties are unable

¹ As noted in Judge Murphy’s initial motion, it is unclear what the original deadline was for the answer (e.g., was the deadline calculated from the date of filing or service, and, if service, was personal service required). While framed as a request for an extension of time, in essence, the original motion was a request to establish the initial deadline for the answer.

to reach a resolution by December 14, 2025, Judge Murphy will be prepared to answer and the Panel may expeditiously move the case forward.

8. Finally, if the parties cannot reach a resolution, counsel does not foresee any reason that the answer cannot be filed by December 14, 2025. Thus, counsel anticipates this is the final request for additional time.

WHEREFORE, Respondent respectfully requests that the Panel extend the deadline for the filing of Judge Murphy's answer to December 14, 2025.

Respectfully submitted this 24th day of November, 2025.

RECHT KORNFELD, P.C.

By: S/ Nathan Bruggeman
Nathan Bruggeman (#39621)
David M. Beller (#35767)

Attorneys for Respondent

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on this 24th day of November, 2025, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing **UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME TO ANSWER COMPLAINT** was filed with the 2d Judicial District Support Staff by emailing a copy to kenidee.bronner@judicial.state.co.us and nikolaus.zender@judicial.state.co.us, and was served on the following via email, addressed as follows:

Jeffrey M. Walsh, Esq.
j.walsh@jd.state.co.us
Special Counsel for Complainant
Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline

S/ Karina English