

**Colorado Supreme Court Legal Technology Advisory Committee
Minutes of the April 23, 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 April 23, 2026, in the Court of Appeals’ Full 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	
Kelley Oldberg, Counsel to the Office of the Chief Justice		X
Guests:		
Matt Knaster, an associate who works with Colin Moriarty	X	

I. Approval of minutes of the March 12 meeting.

A member made a motion, which another member seconded, to approve the March 12 meeting minutes. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

II. Subcommittee reports.

a) Research Subcommittee (Nick Ballou, chair).

The research subcommittee presented a report comparing various states’ and the ABA’s respective AI guidance documents. The subcommittee members favored the Michigan model for its comprehensive, balanced, and accessible format, length, tone, and structure, which made it clear and practical for both

legal professionals and pro se litigants. Members noted that some states' documents were either too brief to be useful or too lengthy and dense for busy judges and practitioners.

In response to a question from a member, the Chair clarified that, although the Committee will submit the completed guideline document to the Chief Justice for review and approval, it is intended to be a public-facing document.

The Committee discussed intended audiences, including;

- practicing lawyers;
- judges and other judicial officers;
- law students and new lawyers;
- licensed legal paraprofessionals and other approved legal-service providers;
- self-represented litigants; and
- members of the public interacting with the legal system.

The Committee discussed how to organize the guideline document — whether its structure should follow the tasks assigned to the subcommittees or should be based on the Rules of Professional Conduct. Several members favored a structure driven by practical scenarios and audiences rather than by the Rules. Committee members recommended separate sections for self-represented litigants and legal professionals.

The Committee explored structuring the guidelines to include universal principles applicable to all users, followed by targeted recommendations for specific user categories, such as litigators, transactional lawyers, in-house counsel, and self-represented litigants. The Committee discussed whether the guidelines should consider law students as a distinct user group, although the Chief Justice's charge to the Committee had not mentioned students. Members emphasized the importance of digestible content, avoiding excessive granularity, and including FAQs to address common concerns.

- Start with general principles applicable to all readers;
- Add three to five targeted recommendations for each user category to maintain focus and usability;
- Include FAQs tailored to each user group to address practical questions;

- Avoid excessive detail leading to an unwieldy document and potential reader disengagement.

The Committee also discussed creating a small style committee later in the process to harmonize tone, terminology, and formatting across the document.

The Committee acknowledged the rapid evolution of AI technology and the need that the document remain evergreen and accessible to users with varying technical skills.

b) Fundamentals of AI Technology (Colin Moriarty, chair).

The Fundamentals Subcommittee reported on its recommendation of an introductory chapter explaining core AI concepts in plain language. Proposed topics included:

- what generative AI tools are and a high-level discussion of how they function;
- tools' strengths and limitations;
- hallucinations and error states;
- iterative workflows and responsible human review;
- privacy and confidentiality concerns;
- differences among categories of tools; and
- how AI issues intersect with ethics and court administration.

Members stressed that the chapter should avoid excessive technical jargon and be understandable to non-technical readers. The Committee discussed the merits of including a glossary or appendix of key terms.

c) Transformational Aspects of Generative AI (Judge Guillon, chair).

The subcommittee reported that this part of the guidance document would focus on how AI is currently changing legal and judicial work, while cautiously addressing likely near-term developments.

Illustrative current use cases discussed would include:

- legal research and summarization;
- drafting correspondence, memoranda, and pleadings;
- contract review and transactional support;

- case management functions;
- administrative uses within courts;
- translation and accessibility functions; and
- assistance to self-represented litigants.

The Committee members favored using practical “user stories” or examples showing how different users might responsibly employ AI tools, followed by guidelines based on those cases. Members agreed that speculative long-term predictions should receive less emphasis than present and near-term realities.

d) Generative AI Resources (Colin Moriarty, chair).

Members discussed the challenge of identifying evergreen educational resources because specific products and training materials evolve rapidly. The Committee generally favored emphasizing enduring principles for evaluating tools rather than endorsing specific vendors. A member noted that, like learning to swim, learning AI tools requires practice.

Topics discussed included:

- learning through hands-on experimentation in secure environments;
- evaluating outputs critically;
- understanding pricing and access barriers;
- determining whether tools are approved for organizational use;
- cybersecurity and data-governance review; and
- ongoing professional education.

The Chair also referenced information-sharing efforts among judges in other jurisdictions regarding AI implementation and best practices, including through the Judicial Artificial Intelligence Consortium (JAIC). The Committee noted the importance of highlighting security issues, including how judges should not use AI tools without official approval.

e) Generative AI's Implications for Professional Ethics and the Unauthorized Practice of Law Rules (Julia Martinez, chair).

The subcommittee reported that its portion of the guideline document would identify the ethics rules potentially implicated by AI use and provide practical guidance.

Subjects discussed included:

- competence and technological understanding;
- confidentiality and protection of client information;
- supervision of lawyers, staff, and vendors;
- candor to tribunals and verification of authorities;
- reasonableness of fees when AI increases efficiency;
- communication with clients concerning AI-assisted work; and
- issues concerning the unauthorized practice of law.

Members noted that questions concerning future amendments to court rules may be appropriate for separate recommendations after submission of the guidance document. The subcommittee seeks feedback on integrating best practices versus merely presenting a bare-bones rules list.

The Committee considered including appendices with FAQs, checklists, and exemplar disclosure documents. Members considered the diversity of organizational needs, from solo practitioners to large firms and government entities, and the possibility of AI-generated customized guidelines for different types of entities. Committee members discussed balancing comprehensive guidance with avoiding overwhelming users with information.

f) Generative AI and Self-Represented Litigants (Lois Lupica, chair).

The Committee discussed the special issues arising when members of the public use AI tools for legal assistance. The subcommittee discussed developing detailed guidelines for AI tools accessible to this group, distinguishing between general purpose AI platforms and purpose-built legal assistance tools. The subcommittee addressed risks such as hallucination, bias, and data exposure, and emphasized the need for trusted tools integrated into public interest infrastructure to prevent a two-tier justice system, as well as the importance of steering users toward trusted tools and integrating them with existing public resources. In addition, the subcommittee discussed the courts' responsibility in supporting self-represented litigants' use of AI tools.

Members also discussed:

- the risk of inaccurate legal information;
- overconfidence in AI outputs;
- privacy concerns when entering personal facts;
- privilege and confidentiality issues;
- need for verification and trusted sources; and
- integration with existing court-help resources.

Members emphasized that the guidelines should help direct users toward reliable resources while candidly explaining limitations.

g) Generative AI and Legal Professionals (Magistrate Ward, chair).

The subcommittee is preparing a high level section focused on traditional legal professionals and judicial officers.

The subcommittee will address competence, data security, supervisory responsibilities, and workflow integration, emphasizing well-accepted concepts. Its draft will avoid granular, practice-specific mandates, focusing on general principles. The subcommittee will also discuss the need for verification and trusted sources and integration with existing court-help resources.

The subcommittee requested feedback from Committee members to identify overlaps with other subcommittees' work and gaps in topics covered.

III. Next steps.

The Committee discussed an approximate overall target length of fifty pages, recognizing that substance would control over page count. The Committee will strive to create a product detailed enough to be useful but concise enough to be read.

The Committee set a timeline aiming for draft chapters to be circulated by May 22, allowing time for review before the May 28 meeting.

IV. New business.

The Committee had no new business

V. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:29 p.m.

VI. Upcoming meeting dates: May 28, 2026 (Supreme Court Conference Room); June 25, 2026 (Court of Appeals Full Court Conference Room); and September 10, 2026 (Supreme Court Conference Room).

Respectfully submitted,

Committee Secretary