

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO  
Oral Argument: Tuesday, October 20, 2026  
Bailiff: Chambers of Justice Blanco

---

9:00 a.m.  
EN BANC

24SC196 (1 HOUR)

**Petitioner/Cross-Respondent:**

Skylan M. Brassill,

**v.**

**Respondent/Cross-Petitioner:**

The People of the State of Colorado

**For the Petitioner/Cross-Respondent:**

Cassandra Zobel  
ZOBEL LAW, LLC

**For the Respondent/Cross-Petitioner:**

Frank R. Lawson  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

**For Amicus Curiae, Rocky Mountain  
Victim Law Center:**

Katherine Houston  
ROCKY MOUNTAIN VICTIM LAW  
CENTER

Certiorari to the Court of Appeals, 2023CA58

Docketed: March 24, 2024

At Issue: May 19, 2026

ISSUE(S)

Whether a district court loses authority to impose restitution if the prosecution does not exercise diligent efforts to bring restitution information to sentencing.

Whether the division erred in affirming the district court's restitution order, despite finding the prosecution did not exercise diligent efforts to bring restitution information to sentencing.

Whether the defendant may seek dismissal of restitution proceedings based on the prosecution failing to use "reasonable diligence" to gather restitution information prior to sentencing.

---

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO  
Oral Argument: October 20, 2026  
Bailiff: Chambers of Justice Blanco

---

10:00 a.m.  
EN BANC

24SC704 (40 MINUTES)

**Petitioner:**

Robert J. Solano,

**v.**

**Respondent:**

The People of the State of Colorado.

**For the Petitioner:**

Claire Pakis  
COLORADO STATE PUBLIC  
DEFENDER

**For the Respondent:**

Carmen Moraleda  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Certiorari to the Court of Appeals, 2022CA922  
Docketed: November 7, 2024  
At Issue: April 8, 2026

ISSUE(S)

[REFRAMED] Whether the court of appeals erred in concluding that the People complied with their obligation to present the restitution information in accordance with section 18-1.3-603(2)(a), C.R.S. (2024), where, at sentencing, the defendant neither objected on the ground that the restitution information was already available nor requested that the People make a record related to the availability of the restitution information.

[REFRAMED] Whether, under *People v. Weeks*, 2021 CO 75, 498 P.3d 142, the district court loses authority to order restitution due to the prosecution's lack of compliance with section 18-1.3-603(2)(a), C.R.S. (2024), and, thus, whether the court of appeals erred by applying harmless error review instead of vacating the restitution order.

---

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO  
Oral Argument: October 20, 2026  
Bailiff: Chambers of Justice Blanco

---

2:00 p.m.  
EN BANC

25SC468 (1 HOUR)

**Respondent:**

The People of the State of Colorado,

**In the Interest of**

**Petitioner:**

A. T. S.

**For the Respondent:**

Jacob R. Lofgren  
Gina M. Nykerk  
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

**For the Petitioner:**

Mark Evans  
COLORADO STATE PUBLIC  
DEFENDER

Certiorari to the Court of Appeals, 2022CA1175  
Docketed: August 7, 2025  
At Issue: September 1, 2026

ISSUE(S)

[REFRAMED] Whether the division’s harmless error analysis that applied the *Arteaga-Lansaw* factors contravened binding Supreme Court precedent because it considered the “persuasive force” of the improper testimony rather than “disregarding” it to only consider the weight of the “remaining evidence.”

[REFRAMED] Whether admitting the remote closed-circuit testimony was harmless error.

---

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO  
Oral Argument: Thursday, October 22, 2026  
Bailiff: Chambers of Chief Justice Márquez

9:15 a.m.  
EN BANC

---

Courts in the Community – Overland High School

25SA342 (1 HOUR)

**Plaintiff-Appellee/Cross-Appellant:**

The People of the State of Colorado,

v.

**Defendant-Appellant/Cross-Appellee:**

Edward Benjamin Ruiz.

**For the Plaintiff-Appellee/Cross-Appellant:**

Michael J. Allen

Doyle Baker

Melissa Bollig

Tanya A. Karimi

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY,  
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**For the Defendant-Appellant/Cross-Appellee:**

Julia Chamberlin

COLORADO STATE PUBLIC  
DEFENDER

Transfer from the Court of Appeals, 2025CA2199  
Docketed: November 25, 2025  
At Issue: August 10, 2026

ISSUE(S)

Did the district court err in finding unconstitutional the “reasonably should have known” language in section 18-4-409(2), CRS 2025, the first-degree motor vehicle theft statute?

---

25SC433 (1 HOUR)

**Petitioner:**

Spectrum Retirement Communities, LLC;  
Anson Operator, LLC; Anthem Operator,  
LLC; Burr Ridge Operator, LLC; Carmel  
Operator, LLC; Cary Senior Living, LLC;  
Cedar Park Operator, LLC; Chandler 2  
Operator, LLC; Chandler Operator, LLC;  
Creve Coeur Operator, LLC; Dougherty  
Ferry Operator, LLC; Fishers Operator, LLC;  
Gahanna Operator, LLC; Gilbert Operator,  
LLC; Green Oaks Operator, LLC;  
HighPointe Operator, LLC; Hilliard  
Operator, LLC; Lakeway Operator, LLC;  
Lakeway Overlook, LLC; Lakeway  
Townline, LLC; Lincoln Meadows Senior  
Living, LLC; Lombard Operator, LLC;  
Lone Mountain Operator, LLC; Mason  
Operator, LLC; Mesa Operator, LLC; Park  
Meadows Senior Living, LLC; Peakview  
Operator, LLC; Peoria Senior Living, LLC;  
PH Operator, LLC; Pickerington Operator,  
LLC; Powell 2 Operator, LLC; Reavis St.  
Holdings, LLC; Reavis St.  
Operator, LLC; Round Rock Operator, LLC;  
Santa Fe Operator, LLC; Saxony Operator,  
LLC; SF Overland Park,  
LLC; S-K Anson Opportunity II, LLC; S-K  
Anthem Opportunity I, LLC; S-K Burr Ridge  
Residential, LLC; S-K Carmel, LLC; S-K  
Cary, LLC; S-K Cedar Park Opportunity II,  
LLC; S-K Chandler 2 Opportunity I, LLC; S-  
K Chandler Owner, LLC; S-K Crestview,  
LLC; S-K Creve Coeur Owner, LLC; S-K

**For the Petitioner:**

Michael S. Burg  
David K. TeSelle  
Holly B. Kammerer  
Shane C. Fulton  
D. Dean Batchelder  
BURG SIMPSON  
ELDREDGE HERSH & JARDINE, P.C.

**For the Respondent:**

Cole A. Wist  
David L. Coats  
ScheLeese Goudy  
SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US), LLP

**For Amicus Curiae, United**

**Policyholders:**

Allan B. Moore  
Jad H. Khazem  
COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP  
Stephen B. Shapiro  
Garth A. Gersten  
OTTESON SHAPIRO, LLP

**For Amicus Curiae, American  
Property Casualty Insurance  
Association:**

Evan Stephenson  
SPENCER FANE, LLP

[CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

---

Courts in the Community – Overland High School

[CONTINUED]

Dougherty Ferry Owner, LLC; S-K Ellisville, LLC; S-K Fishers, LLC; S-K Gahanna, LLC; S-K Gilbert Residential, LLC; S-K Green Oaks, LLC; S-K HighPointe Owner, LLC; S-K Hilliard Owner, LLC; S-K Lombard Owner, LLC; S-K Lone Mountain, LLC; S-K Lone Mountain, Owner, LLC; S-K Mason Opportunity II, LLC; S-K Meridian, LLC; S-K Mesa Opportunity II, LLC; S-K Palos Heights Opportunity II, LLC; S-K Peoria, LLC; S-K Pickerington Opportunity I, LLC; S-K Powell 2 Opportunity I, LLC; S-K Powell Owner, LLC; S-K Round Rock Opportunity I, LLC; S-K Santa Fe Opportunity II, LLC; S-K Saxony Opportunity I, LLC; S-K Shawnee, LLC; S-K Smoky Hill Owner, LLC; S-K South Elgin Opportunity III, LLC; S-K Streamwood Owner, LLC; S-K West Chester Opportunity I, LLC; S-K Westerville Opportunity II, LLC; South Elgin Operator, LLC; Spectrum Park Meadows Land, LLC; Spectrum Retirement of Ohio, LLC; SRC of Arizona, LLC; SRC of Colorado, LLC; SRC of Illinois, LLC; SRC of Indiana, LLC; SRC of Kansas, LLC; SRC of Missouri, LLC; SRC of New Mexico, LLC d/b/a Spectrum Retirement of New Mexico; SRC of Texas, LLC d/b/a Spectrum Retirement of Texas; SRC Rigden Farms, LLC; Streamwood Operator, LLC; West Chester Operator, LLC; Westerville Operator, LLC; and WSPT Hickory View Investors V, LLC,

**v.**

**Respondent:**

Continental Casualty Company.

[CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO  
Oral Argument: Thursday, October 22, 2026  
Bailiff: Chambers of Chief Justice Márquez

10:30 a.m.  
EN BANC

---

Courts in the Community – Overland High School

[CONTINUED]

Certiorari to the Court of Appeals, 2024CA34  
Docketed: July 16, 2025  
At Issue: July 28, 2026

ISSUE(S)

Whether the division erred by holding that the partial loss of use of insured property, or anything less than the total loss of use of the entire insured property (i.e., “complete uninhabitability”), cannot, as a matter of law, constitute “direct physical loss of or damage to” property for purposes of triggering coverage under an all-risk commercial property insurance policy.

[REFRAMED] Whether it was error to conclude under C.R.C.P. 12(c), as a matter of law, that there was no coverage for direct physical damage to insured property, separate and apart from physical loss.

---