



Rocky Mountain Victim Law Center
899 Logan Street, Suite 512
Denver, CO 80203

Wednesday, February 9, 2022

Attorney General Phil Weiser
Assistant Attorney General Ann Luvera
Solicitor General Eric Olson
Office of the Attorney General
Colorado Department of Law
Ralph L. Carr Judicial Building
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor
Denver, CO 80203

SENT VIA EMAIL ONLY TO: ann.luvera@coag.gov; Eric.Olson@coag.gov

Re: Pattern or Practice Complaint re: District Attorney's office in the 12th Judicial District

Dear Attorney General Weiser, Assistant Attorney General Luvera, and Solicitor General Olson:

Rocky Mountain Victim Law Center (RMvlc) is a non-profit law firm that provides free legal services to victims of crime in Colorado. A core focus of RMvlc's work is ensuring the Colorado Crime Victim Rights Act (VRA) is upheld in criminal cases. This is done through education, technical assistance, and by serving as counsel for victims in criminal cases throughout Colorado. Over the past year, RMvlc has seen a dramatic increase in requests for services regarding upholding victim rights from the 12th Judicial District (JD) and witnessed repeated violations of victims' rights by the District Attorney (DA)'s office in that jurisdiction. For that reason, and on behalf of all crime victims in the 12th JD and throughout Colorado, we are submitting this complaint, pursuant to C.R.S. 24-31-113, and respectfully requesting you investigate the pattern or practice of violations of victims' rights in the 12th Judicial District.

We are aware that other efforts are also being made to address these issues, including a referral of VRA complaints from the Crime Victim Services Committee. However, what we have seen over the past year is so egregious that we feel it's necessary to also draw the Attorney General's office's attention to the situation through this complaint.

Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-31-113, “It is unlawful for any governmental authority...to engage in a pattern or practice of conduct...that deprives persons of rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the constitution or laws of the United States or the state of Colorado. Whenever the attorney general has reasonable cause to believe that a violation of this section has occurred [they]...may in a civil action obtain any and all appropriate relief to eliminate the pattern or practice.” The repeated violations of the constitutional and statutory rights of Colorado crime victims by the 12th JD DA’s office undermines the effectiveness of the criminal legal system in that jurisdiction and beyond, necessitating a response equivalent to the level of violations that have occurred.

The rights of crime victims in Colorado are protected under the Colorado Constitution and the VRA. Colo. Const. Art II, Section 16a; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-301 et seq. Among the rights given to victims are “the right to be treated with fairness, respect, and dignity, and to be free from intimidation, harassment, or abuse throughout the criminal justice process.” Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a). Additional rights include the right to be informed, present, and heard at varying stages of the criminal justice process and for required information to be provided in a timely manner. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-303(15)(a). Victims also have “the right to consult with the prosecution after any crime against the victim has been charged, prior to any disposition of the case, or prior to any trial of the case...” and to be properly informed of the status of ongoing cases, specifically any scheduling changes or cancellations. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(e); Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(f). Victims may appear in court with and communicate through a designated representative. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302(3). Victims also have the right to be assured that in any criminal proceeding the court, the prosecutor, and other law enforcement officials will take appropriate action to achieve a swift and fair resolution of the proceedings. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(o).

In establishing the rights of victims, the legislature made the VRA’s purpose clear: “The general assembly hereby finds and declares that the full and voluntary cooperation of victims of and witnesses to crimes with state and local law enforcement agencies as to such crimes is imperative for the general effectiveness and well-being of the criminal justice system of this state. It is the intent of this part 3, therefore, to assure that all victims of and witnesses to crimes are honored and protected by law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and judges in a manner no less vigorous than the protection afforded criminal defendants.” Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-301.

Colorado entrusts its district attorneys and prosecutors with the protection of victims’ rights. This is consistent with the role of a prosecutor as more than just seeking convictions; they are an administrator of justice and an officer of the court. Their duty is to serve the public interest and they should act with integrity. (ABA Criminal Justice Standards – Prosecution Function). The Colorado Constitution and the law places the burden for enforcing and upholding victim rights on the judiciary, law enforcement, and prosecutors. Colo. Const. Art. II Section 16a; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-301; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-3.1-303(1).4

Under the leadership of DA Alonzo Payne, the 12th JD DA’s office has engaged in a pattern or practice of violating crime victims’ rights, depriving them of their rights as protected by the constitution and Colorado laws, which is unlawful under C.R.S. 24-31-113.

DA Payne and the other attorneys in his office have repeatedly failed to treat victims with fairness, respect, and dignity, which is a violation under Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a). The 12th JD DA's office has not provided required information and notifications to victims, has not responded to victim outreach, and has provided false or misleading information about case progress and details to victims, which is in violation of Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b). Not only has DA Payne not conferred with victims about plea offers prior to the very hearing where a plea deal is presented nor considered client objections or concerns (a victim right outlined in Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(e), 303(4)), he has also repeatedly extended offers to defendants that are inappropriate under the circumstances. These plea offers have consistently ignored the severity and violence of the crimes involved and do not show any care for appropriate punishment in the best interest of the community or the victims of those crimes. Overall, the 12th JD DA's office has also shown an extreme reluctance to take cases to trial, seemingly extending very low offers to avoid the possibility of trial. The DA and his prosecutors have also appeared unprepared to fully litigate their cases; they show no passion in their advocacy on behalf of victims and the community, often leaving victims feeling unimportant and unheard.

Below are summaries of specific cases, provided with permission of the victims, that exemplify the pattern or practice of VRA violations at issue in the 12th JD. These examples are in no way an exhaustive list of every case where victims have been deprived of their rights, but they provide a summary of some of the violations our office has seen. These observations are also consistent with those shared with RMVlc by other services providers and community members in the jurisdiction.

1. Alamosa County Case # 2020CR169 – Victim: Danny Von Pruitt

Issues:

1. Right to a fair proceeding - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(o)
2. Failure to inform - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b)
3. Failure to consult - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(e), 303(4)
4. Failure to treat with fairness, respect, and dignity - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a)
5. Interference with post-conviction rights - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(j, q, & r)

In June 2020, Danny Von Pruitt was shot in the back of the head by James Marshall. He was in a medically induced coma for 17 days, and afterwards had to relearn many basic functions, such as standing, walking, and dressing himself. A fragment of the 9mm bullet has remained in Mr. Pruitt's brain and has permanently impaired his short-term memory, attention span, speech, and his ability to control emotions. Over the objection of Mr. Von Pruitt, DA Payne offered the defendant a plea to one count of tampering with a deceased human body (C.R.S. 18-8-610.5), which is neither an accurate reflection of the crime that occurred nor a VRA crime. This plea deal reflects a pattern of using tampering with a deceased body charges to avoid appropriate punishment, which DA Payne has also used to plead down murder charges. This charge fails the central tenant of the VRA that the victim be treated with fairness, respect, and dignity. For DA Payne to formally treat Mr. Von Pruitt as a corpse was both insulting and prevented a proper disposition of the case. It also deprived Mr. Von Pruitt of his rights under the VRA, particularly post-sentencing. The initial charges filed in this case would also have carried a Crime of Violence sentencing enhancement, which would have reflected the gravity of the offense.

The settlement offer was especially concerning because the defendant was known to attorneys at the DA's office prior to the crime. The defendant was a practicing attorney in the 12th JD and had previously been on many cases with attorneys from the DA's office. Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Alex Raines, who appeared on this case, was known to be a friend of the defendant. During discussion of another case, DDA Johanna Hendley stated that the DA's office should not have prosecuted the case because the attorneys at the DA's office knew the defendant well and some were his friends. This conflict of interest was not brought to the court's attention by anyone from the DA's office and is very concerning given their conduct on the case.

2. Alamosa County Case # 2021M249 – Victim: Sheena Mathes

Issues:

1. Right to a fair proceeding - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(o)
2. Failure to inform - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b)
3. Failure to consult - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(e), 303(4)
4. Failure to treat with fairness, respect, and dignity - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a)

Sheena Mathes reported a sexual assault in July 2020 by Costilla County Commissioner Steven Romero and has yet to receive a determination about whether charges will be filed, despite her extensive attempts to have the allegations investigated. Since reporting, it has been difficult for Ms. Mathes to get accurate, up to date information from the DA's office. Ms. Mathes was also granted a temporary civil protection order against Mr. Romero. Then, after an incident with the respondent in the community, she filed a police report for a violation of that protection order. Mr. Romero was charged with the violation; however, DA Payne has repeatedly sought court approval for a plea deal requiring no punishment of the defendant, and has not properly updated or conferred with the victim about the plea offers. On at least one occasion, the DA's office waited until court had begun to inform the victim of an offer.

As a county commissioner, Mr. Romero is involved in making funding decisions that affect the 12th JD DA's office. The victim in this case is also aware that DA Payne and the defendant know each other and are on friendly terms. Despite repeated requests by the victim, the conflict of interest between DA Payne and defendant has never been addressed by the DA's office.

3. Alamosa County Case # 2021CR68 – Victims: Marcia DeMilia via John & Jason Balzer

Issues:

1. Failure to inform - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b)
2. Failure to consult - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(e), 303(4)
3. Failure to treat with fairness, respect, and dignity - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a)

Marcia DeMilia, a vehicular homicide victim in 2021, was survived by sons John and Jason Belzer. Her sons have sought to enforce her rights as a victim but have been met with disinterest and disrespect by the 12th JD DA's Office. Their attempts to get information about the case were repeatedly ignored. When they received any information at all, they were given inaccurate information. The DDA on the case also treated the victim's family disrespectfully, angrily storming out of a meeting with them because they asked questions about the investigation. The 12th JD DA's office has demonstrated a lack of willingness to investigate the defendant's potential

intoxication during the incident or his prior criminal history, leading to plea offers that are inappropriate given the circumstances.

4. Saguache County Case # 2020CR050 – Victim: John Luhman

Issues:

1. Failure to consult - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(e), 303(4)
2. Failure to inform - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b)
3. Failure to treat with fairness, respect, and dignity - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a)

In December 2019, John Luhman was the victim of domestic violence on multiple occasions. In one incident, Mr. Luhman was attacked by a knife and had a burning object thrown at him. The defendant was charged with third degree assault, domestic violence, criminal mischief, criminal extortion of a vehicle, false imprisonment, menacing, and second-degree assault. Throughout the court process, the DA's office failed to properly notify the victim of court dates, gave him incorrect information to access remote court appearances, and failed to notify him of the court appearance where his case was dismissed. The DA's office also failed to consult with Mr. Luhman about plea offers and did not respond to his emails. When Mr. Luhman sought explanations from the DA's office, they threatened to call the police if he called them again.

5. Alamosa County Case # 2020CR202, 2020M200 – Victim: Lani Welch

Issues:

1. Failure to consult - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(e), 303(4)
2. Failure to inform - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b)
3. Failure to treat with fairness, respect, and dignity - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a)

In June 2020, Lani Welch reported instances of domestic violence, assault, and stalking by Jeffrey Tonso. Mr. Tonso was charged with misdemeanor DV assault and felony stalking. Two separate cases were filed against Mr. Tonso, one felony and one misdemeanor. At the time the cases were filed, Mr. Tonso was on probation from a previous domestic violence case with a different victim. In fact, Mr. Tonso had at least 5 prior domestic violence convictions. Despite that fact, DA Payne refused to charge Mr. Tonso as a habitual domestic violence offender.

In March 2021, Ms. Welch attended a bond hearing. During the hearing, Ms. Welch expressed her desire to speak with DA Payne. The judge weighed in and asked that DA Payne take the time to speak with Ms. Welch. DA Payne replied that the Victim's Advocate had already spoken to Ms. Welch and therefore he did not need to speak with her.

Ms. Welch was told there would be no plea offer in this case. However, while on her way to court an hour before the scheduled preliminary hearing on March 15th, 2021, she received a call from the DA's Office. It was only at that point that she was informed of the plea agreement and told it would be addressed at the hearing. Ms. Welch was able to advocate for herself and the offer was pulled. A plea offer that was acceptable to Ms. Welch, the defense, and the court was offered but DA Payne refused to agree, inserting a lesser charge instead. Ms. Welch, along with a representative from RMvlc, spoke with DA Payne and requested more than an hour's notice regarding a plea agreement. This request was made in part to give Ms. Welch time to absorb the

information, a process made more challenging due to her PTSD. DA Payne's response was to refer her to behavioral health services, which was incredibly dismissive and condescending.

Ms. Welch asked for information regarding her assault case (#20M200) with the same defendant. DA Payne stated that he would not discuss that case with her. DA Payne did not provide additional information as to why he would not discuss the case with Ms. Welch when she was the primary victim in the case. Additionally, it took repeated requests for notification letters to be sent to Ms. Welch to inform her of next steps in the case.

6. Saguache County Case # 2020CR41, 2020CR44 –Victims: Sandra and Andrew Pedrazas
Issues:

1. Failure to inform - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b)
2. Failure to treat with fairness, respect, and dignity - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a)

Ms. Pedrazas owned a rural property that, for several weeks in 2020, was illegally occupied then vandalized and burgled, causing approximately \$200,000 in damages. Originally, two defendants were charged with seven felonies each. One defendant, despite having an outstanding felony warrant at the date of hearing, was offered and accepted a plea agreement for one misdemeanor charge. Due to an outburst at the judge, he was sentenced to 30 days in jail for contempt of court. He did not report to jail and is still a fugitive to this charge. The other defendant, who had also absconded from a PR bond, was offered a settlement of one misdemeanor with 30 days jail time and no probation. Ms. Pedrazas believes that DA Payne lowered charges to avoid having to comply with VRA requirements. Despite this, the court allowed Ms. Pedrazas to appear and to speak in court. Ms. Pedrazas had to provide important information about the case that the DA's office had failed to provide. When Ms. Pedrazas met with DA Payne and asked about the low charges, he became belligerent. This unprofessional behavior left Ms. Pedrazas believing that the DA Payne's conduct on the case was retaliation because she questioned his decisions. DA Payne also refused to provide any explanation for his decision not to charge a third defendant, despite clear evidence including fingerprints and recorded conversations.

7. Anonymous Victim

Issues:

1. Failure to inform - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b)
2. Failure to consult - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(e), 303(4)
3. Failure to treat with fairness, respect, and dignity - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a)

The victim in this case (Victim) wishes to remain anonymous due to concerns of retaliation. Victim is the victim in two separate cases against Victim's ex-partner, one for harassment and the other for sexual assault. Victim had repeatedly sought information about their cases from the 12th JD DA's office but was given inaccurate or incomplete responses.

In Victim's harassment case, Victim expressed concerns about the DA's office having a conflict of interest, which were dismissed out of hand instead of being given any proper consideration. DDA Rivera also misstated on the record that Victim was in support of a proposed plea deal even though Victim was not. Victim was not given accurate information about plea offers in this

case and had previously been told by DDA Hendley that a deferred sentence was not offered. However, a deferred sentence was offered to Defendant. The Court ordered DDA Rivera to meet with Victim to discuss the case and plea deal, but the DA's office did not make any attempt to contact Victim to schedule a meeting and ignored multiple requests from them. When ordered by the Court to speak with Victim at a February appearance on the case (where Victim appeared remotely), DDA Rivera accused Victim of making up wild accusations, was rude and dismissive, and then hung up on Victim. Following that phone call, over the objection of the Victim who wished to have no further contact with the DA's office and at least get closure on the case, DDA Rivera was granted a continuance until March. DDA Rivera stated on the record that this continuance was not to comply with the VRA, to have further contact with Victim, or because of anything to do with the charges or proposed plea, leaving Victim to reasonably believe the continuance was punitive against them.

In October 2021, DA Payne told the court in the sexual assault case that they intended to dismiss the case, leading the court to remove the case from its docket. DA Payne did not then file a motion to dismiss, leaving the case open but inactive. Victim repeatedly reached out to the 12th JD DA's office and was told they did not know what was going on with Victim's case. Victim eventually got information from the court clerk, and Victim's inquiry led the court to re-calendar the case. Victim appeared at the next hearing prepared to deal with their case being dismissed, but the DA's office had still not filed a motion to dismiss and was unable to explain what had happened or why they would be dismissing. An hour after Victim left court, DA Payne filed to dismiss. The motion to dismiss stated they could not prove the case because the parties were married. This reasoning has no basis in the law and appears to be discriminatory on the basis of gender and marital status. The 12th JD DA's office would not respond to any questions from Victim seeking an explanation for their reasoning. Victim was eventually able to schedule a meeting with the DA's office to consult on the motion to dismiss as required by the VRA, but DA Payne failed to appear for the meeting, offering neither explanation nor apology. At a further appearance before the court, the DA's office had to be ordered to properly meet with Victim and again refused to explain the basis for their motion to dismiss. Even following this order from the court, DA Payne made no effort to meet with Victim and ignored calls to schedule a meeting. In the following court appearance, DA Payne offered no explanation for refusing to meet with Victim and the case was dismissed.

DA Payne has refused to explain the reasoning for dismissal, leaving Victim to reasonably believe that he makes a distinction for sexual assault cases involving married parties. Colorado law makes no such distinction, and DA Payne's choices reflect an outdated, discriminatory belief that marriage excuses sexual abuse. Victim's interactions with the DA's office have been extremely retraumatizing.

8. Conejos County Case # 2021CR26 – Victim: Lisa Larsen

Issues:

1. Failure to inform - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b)
2. Failure to consult - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(e), 303(4)
3. Failure to treat with fairness, respect, and dignity - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a)

Lisa Larsen is a survivor of domestic violence. Though her offender was charged, Ms. Larsen was not kept informed about the status of the case. By speaking to members of the community, she eventually found out there was a plea offer in the case. Ms. Larsen scheduled a meeting with the ADA on the case to discuss this plea offer. At the meeting, the ADA displayed incredibly unprofessional behavior by yelling at her, pounding on his desk, and discrediting her experience. The ADA would not answer any of her questions and told her that incidents of past victimization did not matter because he already pled the case. The defendant ended up not pleading to that offer. Later, the ADA extended a different offer. While Ms. Larsen was informed of this new offer, the ADA still did not confer with her, and she learned about the new offer mere hours before the hearing.

9. Alamosa County Case # 2021CR81 – Victim: Grace McQuaggue

Issues:

1. Failure to inform - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(b)
2. Failure to consult - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(e), 303(4)
3. Failure to treat with fairness, respect, and dignity - Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-4.1-302.5(1)(a)

Grace McQuaggue, a sexual assault survivor, was told the day before a hearing that DA Payne intended to dismiss her case. Prior to telling Ms. McQuaggue of the dismissal, the DA's office never spoke with her about the case or brought up any concerns they had regarding the charges so that they could appropriately decide whether to go forward. Ms. McQuaggue only received information about her case if she proactively contacted the DA's office. Following dismissal, Ms. McQuaggue made multiple requests to meet with the DA Payne to better understand his decision to dismiss. These requests were not responded to in any way.

The cases above, along with information from our other work in the jurisdiction, and statements made to our staff from members of the community, show patterns of inappropriate and unlawful behavior by DA Payne and his office. Among the trends observed in the jurisdiction is the pattern of dismissing cases, seemingly to avoid taking them to trial, leaving victims who believed justice would be served once charges were filed left confused and re-traumatized. Of course, prosecutors must exercise independent judgement and discretion in their cases; it would be harmful both to defendants and the community's interest for prosecutors to pursue cases they did not believe they could prove beyond a reasonable doubt. However, that power and discretion must be used fairly and honestly. Otherwise, it becomes a tool for abuse, depriving victims of their constitutional and statutory rights. The 12th JD DA's office has, thus far, seemingly applied their discretion indiscriminately and without providing proper notification or explanation to victims when cases are dismissed.

DA Payne has also established a pattern of failing to inform victims as required by the VRA. Victims must repeatedly reach out to the office themselves for updates, and even then, only periodically receive a response. They are also often informed of key facts or updates about the case at the last minute, the day before court, or even as court has already begun. The information victims receive has also changed quickly, to a degree that victims cannot safely rely on what they have

been told. These victims consistently have resorted to researching Colorado laws, searching online for dockets, calling court clerks, and overall making efforts to do the work entrusted to prosecutors by Colorado law and our Constitution.

During criminal cases, prosecutors are required to attest to having complied with the VRA or explain why they have not been able to. In every case outlined above, and in others not named here, DA Payne has claimed in court the 12th JD DA's office is VRA compliant. RMvlc attorneys have repeatedly witnessed attorneys from the 12th JD DA's office make misstatements on the record about VRA compliance. We are very concerned about the rights of victims who have not received legal advocacy or representation from an outside source, and what misinformation the court has received about supposed VRA compliance in those cases.

Pursuant to the VRA, victims of crime may file a complaint with the Division of Criminal Justice if they believe their VRA rights were violated. When complaints are accepted by the Victim's Rights Act Subcommittee, the party complained about is given the opportunity to respond. Over the past year, victims have made at least nine complaints against the 12th JD DA's office. Our understanding is that this is far more complaints than in previous years and represents a disproportionate percentage of VRA complaints in Colorado when controlling for the number of VRA cases in a jurisdiction. The 12th JD DA's office has largely ignored the Subcommittee's request for information and not issued responses to complaints. When the VRA Subcommittee has recommended remedial steps, in the very rare instances the DA's office has taken part, their participation has been lackadaisical and dismissive. The VRA complaint process is the main avenue victims are given to address a violation of their rights, but it becomes ineffective if the entities against whom complaints are made refuse to participate in the process or make any recommended changes to their policies and practices to ensure the rights of victims are upheld.

The VRA Subcommittee has now referred at least four complaints from the 12th JD to the Crime Victim Services Committee, which, for the first time in the nearly 30-year history of the VRA, has sent the complaints to the Governor's office for review and investigation. The 12th JD DA's office has used the slow, determinative nature of the VRA process to avoid enforcement or accountability. However, those complaints should not be the only ones reviewed by this office. The 12th JD DA's office's pattern and practice of violating the rights of crime victims goes well beyond the cases of victims who have chosen to file a VRA complaint, and the conduct of the entire office should be investigated.

The current reality in the 12th JD is that the DA's office has become an opponent of victims in their fight for justice, instead of acting as an aide and guide as required by Colorado statute and the Colorado Constitution. The problem is pervasive and widespread, and felt across the community. When we speak to one victim, they tell us stories about other mistreated victims, and the community's faith and trust in the judicial system has been harmed. That cannot stand.

While there have been personnel changes in the 12th JD DA's office, the patterns our office has seen are widespread, and are not limited just to those who are no longer there. Indeed, the high turnover in the office has in no way remediated the failures of that office, it is, rather, indicative

of the culture and environment of the office and has exacerbated the failure to uphold the rights of victims.

Our goal in filing this complaint is to ensure all the resources and support possible can be leveraged to address the pattern and uphold the rights of victims. We respectfully request you accept this complaint and further investigate these violations, on behalf of all Colorado crime victims, but particularly on behalf of those who have experienced victimization in the 12th JD.

Sincerely,



Emily Tofte Nestaval
Executive Director