Colorado Independent Judicial Discipline Adjudicative Board	
IN RE THE MATTER OF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO, Complainant, v. IAN JAMES MACLAREN, A County Court Judge of the 22nd Judicial District, Respondent.	▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲ CCJD Case No.: 24-176

THE PARTIES' JOINT PROPOSED CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER

The case management conference is set for: [Panel to insert date].

1. The "at issue date" is: **October 31, 2025**. Pursuant to this Panel's March 23, 2026 CMO Extension Order, the CMO is due Thursday, **March 26, 2026**.

2. Responsible attorney's name, address, phone number and email address:

Jeffrey M. Walsh
Special Counsel
Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
1300 Broadway, Suite 210
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 457-5131
j.walsh@jd.state.co.us

3. The lead counsel for each party met and conferred by telephone concerning this Proposed Order and each of the issues listed in C.R.C.P. 16(b)(3)(A) through (E) on **March 25, 2026.**

4. Brief description of the case and identification of the issues to be tried:

   a. Complainant's Statement of Claims: This past winter, in a criminal matter, Judge Ian MacLaren disagreed with the parties' negotiated outcome – a diversion

agreement. The law requires a judge to stay all proceedings upon receipt of a diversion agreement. Judge MacLaren did not stay the proceeding. Instead, he ordered the parties to his courtroom under the pretext of a hearing. He invited the media to attend, thus turning the "hearing" into a de facto press conference. Then he used this de facto press conference to criticize and shame the parties and to generate publicity about the same.

In response to the Commission on Judicial Discipline's inquiry about the above, Judge McLaren made several material false representations that adversely reflect on his integrity. For example, Judge MacLaren adamantly denied inviting the press to the above-referenced hearing. Yet text messages between he and his romantic partner – the journalist he invited to the hearing – squarely contradict this denial.

In addition to the above misconduct, and on the heels of learning he was under evaluation for judicial ethics violations, Judge MacLaren engaged in additional misconduct. In June, Judge MacLaren was boating on McPhee Reservoir in Montezuma County when he was pulled over by Colorado Parks and Wildlife officers for driving his boat with expired registration stickers. During the stop, he told the officers he was a judge in an apparent attempt to avoid the dictates of the law – that he be ticketed and barred from continued recreation on the reservoir until he obtained a current boat registration. This conduct reflects additional poor judgment not befitting a judge.

b. Respondent's Statement of Claims: Judge MacLaren was appointed as a County Court Judge in Montezuma County in the 22nd Judicial District in November 2024. In one of his first assigned cases, he presided over an existing criminal case that had been widely publicized in that small, rural community. In February 2025, the District Attorney and the Defendant stipulated to resolve the criminal charge involving unreported abuse of a minor, which had enflamed the community for months, by a diversion agreement. The proposed disposition concerned Judge MacLaren, causing him to set the matter for an appearance for clarification as to the propriety of that decision. He did not believe that such an appearance violated the law regarding an automatic stay, which does not make clear whether the stay should enter via written order or in a hearing. He had never entered a stay via a written order, and the DA had not requested one. Judge MacLaren also did not understand that his inquiries of the parties differed from other proceedings in which he approved diversion agreements in open court. Judge MacLaren has never denied that he informed a local reporter, who worked for the newspaper that previously reported on the story giving rise to the criminal charges, that there would be a matter of interest that she may want to observe on the day of the scheduled appearance. It was not his intent to create a de facto press conference, as alleged. In the context of a personal relationship with the reporter, she had asked him to let her know when hearings in the case would be held, and he did so, which in hindsight he understands was not appropriate. The purpose in setting the appearance was a perhaps ill-conceived effort of transparency. He believed the public interest in the case warranted an explanation to the public that the Court had no discretion in imposing

a stay on the proceeding, regardless of his discomfort with the diversion agreement. Judge MacLaren made some errors in judgment, which he has acknowledged. However, those errors stem largely from being an extremely new judge, with very little experience in criminal law.

While the investigation regarding the criminal case remained pending, Judge MacLaren had an encounter with two Department of Wildlife officers regarding the expired registration on his boat. He did not attempt to influence the officers when he mentioned that he was a Judge. His reasoning at the time was to explain that he had a job that did not afford him the luxury of going to the agency during business hours to renew the registration in person. He realizes in hindsight that it was poor judgment on his part to state expressly that he was a Judge. This situation, too, can most objectively be viewed as a "rookie" mistake, from which Judge MacLaren can learn.

The real issue in this case relates to Judge MacLaren's early statements to the Commission. In responding to the Commission's RFE about his conduct with respect to the criminal case, Judge MacLaren reverted to communicating as a lawyer. He disagreed with the characterization of his words and actions and unsuccessfully attempted to explain himself. The Commission immediately concluded that Judge MacLaren lied, although he did not dispute the majority of the basic facts. He did not attempt to deceive the Commission and is willing to accept appropriate and proportional consequences for his actions in the criminal case and with the Department of Wildlife officers; however, Judge MacLaren's attempts to explain himself, however inartful, were not knowingly dishonest statements. Removal of a very young, inexperienced Judge, in a rural jurisdiction in need of dedicated judicial officers, is disproportionately punitive.

5. The following motions have been filed and are unresolved: **None**.

6. Brief assessment of each party's position on the application of the proportionality factors, including those listed in C.R.C.P. 26(b)(1):

   a. Complainant's Assessment of Proportionality: This is a simple case. Few facts are in dispute because most of them are contained in court records, transcripts, video/audio recordings, letters authored by the judge, and text messages authored by the judge. Most of the discoverable documents and information have already been exchanged by the parties via the Rule 26 initial disclosures. The Commission's initial disclosures comprised a mere 138 pages. Respondent's initial disclosures comprised a mere 108 pages, many of them duplicative of the Commission's disclosures. The Commission believes that these sparse initial disclosures comprise what will be the bulk of all the discovery in the case, excluding depositions. Thus, while the Commission recognizes that the issues at stake in this case are very important (i.e. they implicate the very integrity of the judiciary), this case can and should be brought to hearing quickly and without a great deal of motions practice or litigation from either party.

b. Respondent's Assessment of Proportionality:
The issues at stake in this matter are of great importance, to the Judiciary and to Judge MacLaren individually, as he defends his integrity and his career from the Commission's misunderstanding of his explanations of his actions, including his acknowledgement of his mistakes. He has limited resources to defend the case, while the Commission maintains resources of a funded government entity to prosecute the matter. Given the limited scope of the disputed facts at issue, and the wide range and impact of possible sanctions, the limitations on discovery described in the proposal below are appropriate.

7. The lead counsel for each party met and conferred concerning possible settlement. The prospects for settlement are: **Unlikely.**

8. Deadlines for:

a. Amending or supplementing pleadings: **Not more than 60 days before the formal disciplinary hearing unless good cause is shown to allow a later amendment or supplement.**

b. Joinder of additional parties: **Not Applicable.**

c. Identifying non-parties at fault: **Not Applicable.**

9. Dates of initial disclosures: **The parties have at this point exchanged initial disclosures. If there are inadequacies, they will be addressed via the discovery process.**

10. If full disclosure of information under C.R.C.P. 26(a)(1)(C) was not made because of a party's inability to provide it, provide a brief statement of reasons for that party's inability and the expected timing of full disclosures and completion of discovery on damages: **Not Applicable.**

11. Proposed limitations on and modifications to the scope and types of discovery, consistent with the proportionality factors in C.R.C.P. 26(b)(1):

a. Number of depositions per party: Special Counsel may take one deposition of the judge and two other persons, in addition to the depositions of experts. Respondent may take one deposition of each person who has filed a Request For Evaluation of the judge and two other persons, in addition to the depositions of experts. Excluding depositions of expert witnesses, the parties shall be permitted an equal number of depositions.

b. Number of interrogatories per party (C.R.C.P. 26(b)(2)(B) limit of 30): **30**

c. Number of requests for production of documents per party (C.R.C.P. 26(b)(2)(D) limit of 20): **20**

d. Number of requests for admission per party (C.R.C.P. 26(b)(2)(E) limit of 20): **20**

e. Any physical or mental examination per C.R.C.P. 35: **Not Applicable.**

f. Any limitations on awardable costs: **No**.

g. State the justifications for any modifications in the foregoing C.R.C.P. 26(b)(2) limitations: **Not Applicable**

12. Number of experts, subjects for anticipated expert testimony, and whether experts will be under C.R.C.P. 26(a)(2)(B)(I) or (B)(II):

a. Complainant's Experts: Complainant does not at this time anticipate calling an expert witnesses during its case in chief. Complainant reserves the right to call any expert witnesses to respond as needed to Respondent's experts.

b. Respondent's Experts: Respondent has not yet determined whether there will be a need to present expert testimony in this matter. If Respondent intends to present expert testimony, Respondent will timely provide the required disclosures to the Complainant.

If more than one expert in any subject per side is anticipated, state the reasons why such expert is appropriate consistent with proportionality factors in C.R.C.P. 26(b)(1) and any differences among the positions of multiple parties on the same side: **Not Applicable.**

13. Proposed deadlines for expert witness disclosure if other than those in C.R.C.P. 26(a)(2):

a. Production of expert reports: **60 days before formal disciplinary hearing.**

b. Production of rebuttal expert reports: **30 days before formal disciplinary hearing.**

c. Production of expert witness files: **Files of any retained experts shall be produced within 7 days of service of the disclosures of those experts' reports.**

State the reasons for any different dates from those in C.R.C.P. 26(a)(2)(C): **Because this case is simple and straightforward as described above.**

14. Oral Discovery Motions. The court (does)(does not) require discovery motions to be presented orally, without written motions or briefs? **The parties will comply with any**

procedures the Panel deems appropriate regarding oral discovery motions.

15. Electronically Stored Information. The parties (do)(**do not**) anticipate needing to discover a significant amount of electronically stored information. The following is a brief report concerning their agreements or positions on search terms to be used, if any, and relating to the production, continued preservation, and restoration of electronically stored information, including the form in which it is to be produced and an estimate of the attendant costs.
The parties do not anticipate needing to discover a significant amount of electronically stored information. All documents should be produced in electronic form, should be unitized, and should be searchable.

16. Parties' best estimate as to when discovery can be completed: **All written discovery, excluding discovery related to expert witnesses, shall be completed 60 days before the date of the formal hearing. Depositions of expert witnesses may occur up to 15 day before the date of the formal hearing to accommodate the possible need to depose rebuttal expert witnesses.**

Parties' best estimate of the length of the trial: **3 days.**

Trial will commence on (or will be set by the court later): **TBD**

17. Other appropriate matters for consideration: **The parties request that a 15-minute status conference be scheduled as soon as possible so that a formal disciplinary hearing can be scheduled at a date and time that is acceptable to the parties, their counsel, and the Panel. Counsel for Respondent are not able to accommodate a hearing between the Panel's proposed dates of May 26-29, 2026.**

Respectfully submitted by:

/s/ Jane B. Cox

Jane Cox, Counsel to Respondent
Attorney Reg. No. 45770
Recht Kornfeld PC
1600 Stout Street, Suite 1400
Denver, CO 80202
Ph: 303-573-1900
Email: jane@rklawpc.com

/s/ Jeffrey M. Walsh

Jeffrey M. Walsh, Special Counsel
Attorney Reg. No. 33762
Commission on Judicial Discipline
1300 Broadway, Suite 210
Denver, CO 80203
Ph: 303-457-5131
Email: j.walsh@jd.state.co.us

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on Thursday, March 26, 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **JOINT PROPOSED CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER** was served on counsel for Judge MacLaren via email at: jane@rklawpc.com and david@rklawpc.com, and pursuant to the September 29, 2025 Case Management Order, sent to the Adjudicative Board Panel via email at: candice.boddy@judicial.state.co.us; rachael.erickson@judicial.state.co.us; marci.hoffman@judicial.state.co.us.

/s/ Jeffrey M. Walsh
Jeffrey M. Walsh
Special Counsel
Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline