Colorado Supreme Court Legal Technology Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 10, 2026, Meeting

A quorum being present, the Colorado Supreme Court Legal Technology Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Judge Lino S. Lipinsky de Orlov at noon MST on February 10, 2026, in the Supreme Court Conference Room. The attendees at the meeting were:

Committee Members:	Present	Not Present
The Honorable Lino S. Lipinsky de Orlov, Chair	X	
Katina Banks, Esq.	X	
The Honorable Jill Dorancy	X	
The Honorable Stacy Guillon	X	
April Jones, Esq.	X	
Professor Margot Kaminski	X	
Lois Lupica, Esq.	X	
Julia Martinez, Esq.	X	
Colin Moriarty, Esq.	X	
Damien Riehl, Esq.	X	
Professor Michael Siebecker	X	
The Honorable Thomas Ward	X	
Non-Voting Participants:		
The Honorable Maria E. Berkenkotter, Liaison Justice	X	
Kathryn Michaels, Supreme Court Staff Attorney	X	
Justin Jin, Law Clerk	X	
Nick Ballou, Law Student	X	
Amy Schubert-Zhang, Law Student	X	
Observers:		
Megan Bea, Attorney in Private Practice	X	
Kelley Oldberg, State Courts Administrative Office	X	

I. **Introductions.**

Judge Lipinsky welcomed the attendees and asked them to introduce themselves.

II. **Review of the Chief Justice's Charge to the Committee.**

Judge Lipinsky reminded the Committee members that Chief Justice Márquez had charged the Committee "with drafting and recommending to the Chief Justice guidance materials on the use of technology, including AI, for attorneys, licensed legal paraprofessionals, other legal professionals, judicial officers, and members of the public who have cases in our courts or otherwise interact with them." The Committee's objectives are "to safeguard the integrity of the legal system, promote competent client

service, protect client confidences, support access to justice, and encourage innovation, consistent with the Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct."

The Chief Justice specifically directed the Committee to "make guidance recommendations to the Chief Justice no less than annually, with the first recommendations due by October 1, 2026." Judge Lipinsky noted that this deadline is tight but realistic.

III.　　Proposed Action Plan.

The Committee discussed the proposed action plan that Judge Lipinsky had circulated in advance of the meeting and on which one Committee member had commented. The Committee approved the action plan, with amendments. The final version of the action plan is attached to these minutes.

Committee members noted that several courts and bar associations around the country have promulgated generative AI guidance documents, which range in length from hundreds of pages to concise. A member said that those guidance documents, as well as resources such as the American Bar Association's Formal Opinion 512 regarding "Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools," could provide a template and background information for the Committee's guidance document. Amy Schubert-Zhang and Nick Ballou, students from at University of Denver Sturm College of Law, and Justice Berkenkotter's law clerk Justin Jin volunteered to research these materials.

One member recommended that the Committee create a Google or similar shared document that all Committee members could access and edit. Another member suggested that the Committee meetings be recorded and transcribed using an AI tool, although there is disagreement regarding whether such tools create biased outputs. Although the Supreme Court generally does not allow its committee meetings to be recorded, Justice Berkenkotter said she would discuss with the Court the possibility of authorizing the Committee's meetings to be recorded and transcribed.

Committee members noted that the information-gathering phase of its work and drafting a description of how AI generates text would be straightforward, but that writing the section of the guidance document addressing the implications of generative AI use would take more time.

IV.　　Formation of Subcommittees.

The Committee formed seven subcommittees:

1. *Research Subcommittee.*

   Nick Ballou (chair), Justin Jin, and Amy Schubert-Zhang.

   The members of this subcommittee will collect and summarize information on other jurisdictions' generative AI guidance documents and similar resources.

2. *Fundamentals of AI Technology.*

   Colin Moriarty (chair), Professor Kaminski, and Katina Banks.

   The members of this subcommittee will draft the section of the guidance document providing background information on generative AI technology, including, among other topics, a definition of the term, a summary of its technical foundations, a brief explanation of how generative AI produces output, and a discussion of generative AI's capabilities and limitations.

3. *Transformational Aspects of Generative AI:*

   Judge Guillon (chair), Judge Dorancy, Colin Moriarty, and Damien Riehl.

   This subcommittee will review how generative AI is transforming — and will likely transform over the next twenty-four months — legal work (research, summarization, e discovery, drafting, analytics, and ideation) and the functions performed by judicial officers. The subcommittee will focus on the capabilities of the technology rather than on how it has been used and misused.

4. *Generative AI Resources:*

   Colin Moriarty (chair), Katina Banks, and April Jones.

   This subcommittee will gather information on the AI resources available to legal professionals, judicial officers, and members of the public who interface with the legal system.

5. *Generative AI's Implications for Professional Ethics and the Unauthorized Practice of Law Rules:*

   Julia Martinez (chair), Lois Lupica, Professor Siebecker, and Magistrate Ward.

   This subcommittee will consider how the increasingly widespread use of generative AI among legal professionals and judicial officers implicates the Rules of Professional Conduct, the Code of Judicial Conduct, and the Unauthorized Practice of Law Rules.

6. *Generative AI and Self-Represented Litigants:*

Lois Lupica (chair), Judge Dorancy, Damien Riehl, Professor Siebecker, and Magistrate Ward.

This subcommittee will focus on generative AI's promise for closing the access to justice gap. It will develop guidelines and policies to minimize the risk that self-represented litigants' use of generative AI will result in inaccurate or biased outputs, craft best practices for designing and developing generative AI tools for self-represented litigants, draft recommendations to ensure that generative AI tools do not widen the justice gap between parties who can afford legal representation and those who cannot, and consider quality control standards for public-facing legal generative AI tools.

7. *Generative AI and Legal Professionals:*

Magistrate Ward (chair), Katina Banks, Judge Dorancy, April Jones, and Damien Riehl.

This subcommittee will examine and develop practical guidance on and best practices for the responsible integration of generative AI into the legal profession and the judiciary. The subcommittee will evaluate how generative AI tools affect core competencies and professional ethics, while identifying opportunities for enhanced efficiency, cost savings for clients, and improved access to justice. In addition, the subcommittee will examine risks, such as hallucinated authorities, embedded bias, data leakage, and overreliance. It will translate technical realities into operational standards, best practices, and model policies that enable legal professionals and judicial officers to employ generative AI tools effectively and ethically.

To stay on track to meet the Chief Justice's October 1 deadline, the subcommittees will provide reports at each Committee meeting.

The Committee discussed forming additional committees, as its work progressed, to draft the different sections of the guidance document but to rely on a single final editor.

V. Meeting Schedule.

The Committee agreed to the following meeting schedule. All meetings will be hybrid. Except as noted, the meetings will be held in the Supreme Court Conference Room:

> March 12
> April 23 (Court of Appeals Full Court Conference Room)
> May 28
> June 25

July 30 (Court of Appeals Full Court Conference Room)
September 10

VI.   **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee Secretary

Legal Technology Advisory Committee

Plan for development of an AI legal guidance document for Colorado legal professionals, judicial officers, and the public
Adopted February 10, 2026

I. Background

Chief Justice Márquez's Charge Establishing the Committee

Background: The Chief Justice noted that "[t]he increasing use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) impacts all areas of law. And while AI has the potential to dramatically increase legal professionals' productivity and reduce clients' costs, it can also present risks, including ethical concerns. For example, AI can produce 'hallucinations' — fake citations to legal and other authorities, or fake audio and video files — and create inaccurate answers that sound convincing. AI can also provide outputs that reflect the bias of materials in the training dataset on which the AI tool may rely, such as online posts. Further, careless use of AI can result in loss of the protections for confidential information and work product.

"As with any technology, legal professionals must understand the risks and benefits of AI tools employed in providing services to clients and those tools used by their clients and other legal professionals."

The Committee's Charge: Chief Justice Márquez charged the Committee "with drafting and recommending to the Chief Justice guidance materials on the use of technology, including AI, for attorneys, licensed legal paraprofessionals, other legal professionals, judicial officers, and members of the public who have cases in our courts or otherwise interact with them. The Committee's objectives are to safeguard the integrity of the legal system, promote competent client service, protect client confidences, support access to justice, and encourage innovation, consistent with the Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct.'

Reporting Deadline: The Committee "shall make guidance recommendations to the Chief Justice no less than annually, with the first recommendations due by October 1, 2026."

II. Project Phases

Phase I –Planning and Scoping

Establish Meeting Schedule: Set the Committee's meeting schedule for 2026 and designate a structure for subcommittee coordination, progress tracking, and stakeholder communication.

Set Objectives:

- Generate the AI guideline document specified in the Chief Justice's charge.

- Provide educational programs and draft articles to educate targeted groups regarding the guideline document once the Supreme Court has adopted it.

- Support access to justice by encouraging Colorado Legal Services attorneys, pro bono attorneys, and self-represented litigants to use AI tools effectively and responsibly.

- Promote technological competence in and appropriate use of AI tools among the Colorado legal community, the state judiciary, and other targeted audiences.

- Ensure that the relevant constituencies are provided with an opportunity to offer ideas and suggestions to the Committee.

- Encourage the continued hiring and mentoring of entry-level and junior legal professionals to ensure the continued health of the profession.

Determine Target Audience:

- Colorado legal professionals.

- Colorado judicial officers.

- Self-represented litigants.

- Providers of generative AI tools commonly used by or marketed to legal professionals.

- Colorado Bar Association, local bar associations, and specialty bars.

- University of Colorado and University of Denver law schools.

- Legal technology providers serving Colorado courts and practitioners.

- Members of the public who interface with the legal system.

Identify Core Issues to Be Addressed in the Guidance Document: Key topics include, among others:

- Fundamentals of AI technology.

- How AI is transforming — and will likely transform over the next twenty-four months — legal work (research, summarization, e-discovery, drafting, analytics, and ideation) and the functions performed by judicial officers.

- The AI resources available for legal professionals, judicial officers, and members of the public who interface with the legal system.

- AI use's implications for the Rules of Professional Conduct, the Code of Judicial Conduct, and the Unauthorized Practice of Law Rules.

- How legal professionals, self-represented litigants, and others have misused AI and the risk they will continue to generate inaccurate or biased outputs through AI tools.

- AI's potential negative effects on the profession: fake cases being included in resources, competition for entry-level positions, increased volume of filings, etc.

- Case studies of problem areas: hallucinations, deep fake exhibits, etc.

Establish Subcommittees to Review Existing Guidance Materials: Subcommittees will examine existing AI guidance materials from, among other jurisdictions, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, New Jersey, New York City, New York State, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia, and Washington. In addition, review the American Bar Association's Formal Opinion 512 regarding "Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools."

Subcommittee Reports: After reviewing these guidance materials, each subcommittee will present findings on and conclusions regarding them.

Determine the Form, Format, and Length of the Guidance Document: Based on, among other inputs, the information gleaned from the existing AI materials, decide whether the final document will include an executive summary, checklists and forms, a sample AI policy for

practitioners, and other sections, and determine the length of and level of detail in the document.

Phase II – Drafting and Consultation

Synthesize Lessons from Other Guidance Materials: Identify key themes, model provisions, and approaches in existing guidance materials that are applicable to Colorado's legal environment and consider subject areas missing from those guidance materials.

Develop Preliminary Drafts of the Colorado Guidelines: Discuss scope, tone, and organization of the guidance document, ensuring accessibility for legal professionals, judicial officers, and members of the public.

Solicit Broad Input and Conduct Listening Sessions: Engage stakeholder groups including legal professionals, judicial officers at all court levels, judicial branch staff, representatives of the Colorado federal courts and administrative tribunals, legal organizations (Colorado Bar Association — including its AI Task Force, local bars, specialty bar associations, Colorado Legal Services, Access to Justice Commission), other legal organizations, public stakeholders, and the business community.

Drafting Subcommittees: Assign sections or topics to drafting teams.

Committee Review: Review and edit all sections for consistency and clarity before proceeding to public comment on the final draft of the guidance document.

Phase III – Finalization and Submission

Circulation for Public Comment: Release the draft guidance document for public review and feedback through bar associations, the judicial branch website, and stakeholder outreach.

Incorporate Feedback and Final Edits: Reconvene the Committee to evaluate comments and make final revisions.

Submission to the Supreme Court: Deliver the final guidance document and recommendations to the Colorado Supreme Court by the October 1, 2026, deadline.

Optional Additional Tasks

- Create sample AI policy templates.

- Identify best practices.

- Draft sample AI tool evaluation checklists.

- Provide an annotated bibliography of AI documents and other resources.