

Colorado Supreme Court Legal Technology Advisory Committee
Minutes of the May 28, 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 May 28, 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
Clarisa Huang, one of Judge Lipinsky's summer externs	X	
Suzanne Karrer, Senior Manager Communications (Chief Communications Officer for the judicial branch)	X	

I. Approval of minutes of the April 23 meeting.

A member made a motion, which another member seconded, to approve the April 23 meeting minutes. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

II. Subcommittee reports.

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

The subcommittee presented an eight-page draft of its chapter focused on what legal professionals (including LLPs), court professionals, and judicial officers need to know about generative AI. The draft overlaps with other subcommittees' drafts, which will need to be consolidated in the final editing process. Key concerns include professional erosion due to overreliance on AI, machine bias, and the need for approved AI tools to prevent unauthorized use of tools that may involve unreasonable risk.

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

The subcommittee submitted two drafts: a detailed fourteen-page document addressing development of AI tools for self-represented litigants and a simplified five-page guide addressing self-represented litigants' use of AI for their legal matters. The simplified guide aims to be accessible to non-lawyers, addressing risks, privacy, and courts' expectations. Discussion included the need to clarify enforcement of guidelines, how self-represented litigants can verify legal citations, and the availability of free legal resources.

Committee members praised the simplified guide for its readability and accessibility to lay people and raised concerns about how self-represented litigants can verify legal citations and the availability of free legal resources. One member suggested advocating for free public access to legal data to support AI tools for litigants and discussed an ongoing Georgia case dealing with this issue. The Committee also discussed the need to clarify whether the guidelines are aspirational or enforceable. Also, the statements indicating that the "court will advocate for funding" or take other affirmative steps might raise concerns if the Supreme Court has not already agreed to take those actions.

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

The ethics subcommittee presented a draft covering relevant professional conduct rules related to legal professionals' use of AI. The section includes practice tips and discusses disclosure of AI use to clients. Members debated the necessity and scope of such disclosures, the risk of overreliance on AI, and the need to ensure that AI-drafted or edited work product is comprehensive. The Committee acknowledged that its draft overlaps with those of other subcommittees and the challenge of creating a coherent, unified document. The Committee discussed California's new AI-related provisions to its own attorney ethics rules, but it tabled further discussion of the need to potentially update the AI language in our state's Rules of Professional Conduct.

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

The resources subcommittee compiled a comprehensive document listing AI tools and resources without endorsing specific products. Discussion focused on security risks, particularly regarding tools such as DeepSeek with potential foreign government access. The Committee agreed to

include general warnings about security and the importance of evaluating tool origins and configurations rather than naming specific products.

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

Colin Moriarty presented this subcommittee's report, as Judge Guillon was unable to attend the meeting. The subcommittee submitted a lengthy draft aimed at helping users understand AI applications through use cases, user stories, and risk discussions. The user stories were praised for making the content relatable and practical. The Committee discussed the potential for graphic design elements, such as simple images, to enhance comprehension and engagement, especially for non-legal audiences.

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

The fundamentals section provides a technical overview of AI, explaining how models work and their limitations. The Committee acknowledged the section's length and discussed the possibility of condensing it and adopting a more accessible format like that of the self-represented litigants' guide. The goal is to equip readers with foundational knowledge to understand subsequent guidance.

g. Research Subcommittee (Nick Ballou, chair).

The research subcommittee added the Silicon Valley Arbitration and Mediation Center guidelines to the list of AI resources, and also offered ongoing support to other groups as needed.

III. Document content.

The Committee discussed issues concerning the organization of the final document, including the inclusion of universal principles and targeted recommendations. The Committee agreed that the document should contain a conclusion that summarizes principles and recommendations, ensure easy access to the self-represented parties' section, and include a glossary or FAQs that could be partially AI-generated. Appendices were deemed less important. The Committee emphasized the importance of pulling key recommendations into a separate section for clarity. The Committee acknowledged the need for editorial assistance, with plans for Damien Riehl and Colin Moriarty to collaborate on creating a unified document for review and editing.

IV. Next steps.

The Committee's next meeting, which is scheduled for June 25, will focus on reviewing the consolidated document. The deadline for the next draft is close of business on June 19. That draft should include (1) an executive summary, (2) principles, and (3) clear language. The chapter intended for non-legal professionals needs to be easy to find. AI tools will be used to check readability and to assist with indexing, summarizing, and improving readability. Committee members will provide their feedback on this single document.

V. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 p.m.

VI. Upcoming meeting dates: June 25, 2026 (Court of Appeals Full Court Conference Room); July 30 (Court of Appeals Full Court Conference Room); and September 10, 2026 (Supreme Court Conference Room).

Respectfully submitted,

Committee Secretary