## Amendment 40 Term Limits for Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Judges

#### **Amendment 40 proposes a change to the Colorado Constitution that:**

- limits the number of terms that Colorado Supreme Court justices and Court of Appeals judges, called appellate court judges, may serve;
- reduces the term of Supreme Court justices from ten years to four years, and of Court of Appeals judges from eight years to four years;
- requires appellate court judges who have already served ten years or more to leave their current position in January 2009; and
- requires appellate court judges who are eligible to serve another term to appear on the November 2008 ballot for retention.

#### **Summary and Analysis**

The Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. The Colorado Supreme Court consists of seven justices who serve ten-year terms. The Colorado Court of Appeals consists of nineteen judges who serve eight-year terms. When a vacancy occurs on either of these courts, an appointed commission selects three nominees for consideration by the governor. The governor then appoints one of the three nominees to fill the vacancy.

What happens after a judge is appointed? After appointment, appellate judges serve an initial two-year term and then stand for retention at the next general election. At a retention election, voters vote to either keep a judge in office or to remove a judge from office. If voters choose to keep the judge in office, he or she serves an additional term before standing for retention again. There is currently no limit on the number of terms a judge can serve, but judges are required to retire at age 72.

How does Amendment 40 change the current system? Amendment 40 limits Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges to three terms – one initial two-year term plus two four-year terms. Appellate judges who, as of the November 2008 election, have already served ten years will not be eligible to serve another term in their current position. Judges who are eligible to continue serving will appear on the November 2008 ballot for retention.

#### **Arguments For**

- 1) Amendment 40 limits the number of years that a judge can influence the decisions of the state's two highest courts. By creating more turnover in office, it provides new perspectives and more opportunity for other judges to serve on the state's two highest courts. Voters have already limited the number of terms that elected officials in the legislative and executive branches may serve; Amendment 40 applies term limits to the highest officials in the judicial branch as well.
- 2) The current options available to remove a judge from office are inadequate. No Supreme Court justice or Court of Appeals judge in Colorado has ever been removed by voters in a retention election. Further, impeachment of judges is almost never used, and there is no process to recall a judge. As a result, judges can essentially serve as long as they want up until the mandatory retirement age. Amendment 40 ensures that after an appellate judge's initial two-year term, he or she does not serve more than eight additional years in that position.
- 3) Judges on Colorado's two highest courts should be held accountable more frequently than every eight to ten years. Requiring appellate judges to stand for retention every four years allows the public to evaluate the performance and decisions of these judges more often. All other judges in Colorado stand for retention every four to six years; Amendment 40 will make the terms of appellate judges more similar to the other courts.

#### **Arguments Against**

1) Amendment 40 will force five current Supreme Court justices and seven Court of Appeals judges from office in January 2009. Some of these judges will be leaving office before serving the full term that voters previously approved. In 2009, the governor will appoint new judges to the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, including a majority of the justices of the Supreme Court. This means that in 2009, one political party will have substantial influence over the membership of the state's two highest courts. Further, every ten years thereafter, the governor may have the ability to appoint a large number of the judges to these two courts.

- 2) Limiting the terms of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges is unnecessary. Judges are already held accountable through performance evaluations, retention elections, oversight by a state judicial discipline commission, possible impeachment, and mandatory retirement at age 72. Further, Amendment 40 may discourage the best candidates from pursuing judgeships on the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Qualified lawyers will have to choose between continuing an established career or accepting a short-term position on the bench.
- 3) Amendment 40 removes judges regardless of their skills, accomplishments, or experience. It is essential for judges to understand particular areas of legal theory and how laws develop over time. This knowledge comes from years of serving on the court. With the limit on terms, judges will be required to step down when their experience is most beneficial to the court.

Based on current terms, at least five of seven Supreme Court justices and seven of nineteen Court of Appeals judges will leave office on January 13, 2009. Replacement justices and judges may need time to receive training in judicial procedure and to review pending cases, which could create a case backlog and increase workload for agencies working in the court system. Any case backlog will depend on the number of appeals filed and the number of cases resolved during the next two years. It is estimated that if additional resources are needed, they will be requested during the annual budget process.

### Mr. John Andrews

## Amendment 40 Term Limits for Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Judges

- limits the number of terms that Colorado Supreme Court justices and Court of Appeals judges, called appellate court judges, may serve;
- reduces the term of Supreme Court justices from ten years to four years, and of Court of Appeals judges from eight years to four years;
- requires appellate court judges who have already served ten years or more to leave their current position in January 2009; and
- requires appellate court judges who are eligible to serve another term to appear on the November 2008 ballot for retention.

#### **Summary and Analysis**

The Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. The Colorado Supreme Court consists of seven justices who serve ten-year terms. The Colorado Court of Appeals consists of nineteen judges who serve eight-year terms. When a vacancy occurs on either of these courts, an appointed commission selects three nominees for consideration by the governor. The governor then appoints one of the three nominees to fill the vacancy.

What happens after a judge is appointed? After appointment, appellate judges serve an initial two-year term and then stand for retention at the next general election. At a retention election, voters vote to either keep a judge in office or to remove a judge from office. If voters choose to keep the judge in office, he or she serves an additional term before standing for retention again. There is currently no limit on the number of terms a judge can serve, but judges are required to retire at age 72.

How does Amendment 40 change the current system? Amendment 40 limits Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges to three terms – one initial two-year term plus two four-year terms. Appellate judges who, as of the November 2008 election, have already served ten years will not be eligible to serve another term in their current position. Judges who are eligible to continue serving will appear on the November 2008 ballot for retention.

#### **Arguments For**



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

- 1) Amendment 40 limits the number of years that a judge can influence the decisions of the state's two highest courts. TERM LIMITS ARE A CHECK AGAINST THE ABUSE OF JUDICIAL POWER, WHICH CONCERNS MANY CITIZENS TODAY. ADDITIONALLY, by creating more turnover in office, it provides new perspectives and more opportunity for other judges to serve on the state's two highest courts. Voters have already limited the number of terms that elected officials in the legislative and executive branches may serve; Amendment 40 applies term limits to the highest officials in the judicial branch as well.
- 2) The current options available to remove a judge from office are inadequate. No Supreme Court justice or Court of Appeals judge in Colorado has ever been removed by voters in a retention election. Further, impeachment of judges is almost never used, and there is no process to recall a judge. As a result, judges can essentially serve as long as they want up until the mandatory retirement age. Amendment 40 ensures that after an appellate judge's initial two-year term, he or she does not serve more than eight additional years in that position.
- 3) Judges on Colorado's two highest courts should be held accountable more frequently than every eight to ten years. Requiring appellate judges to stand for retention every four years allows the public to evaluate the performance and decisions of these judges more often. All other judges in Colorado stand for retention every four to six years; Amendment 40 will make the terms of appellate judges more similar to the other courts.

#### **Arguments Against**

1) Amendment 40 will force five current Supreme Court justices and seven Court of Appeals judges from office in January 2009. Some of these judges will be leaving office before serving the full term that voters previously approved. In 2009, the governor will appoint new judges to the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, including a majority of the justices of the Supreme Court. This means that in 2009, one political party will have substantial influence over the membership of the state's two highest courts. Further, every ten years thereafter, the governor may have the ability to appoint a large number of the judges to these two courts.

- 2) Limiting the terms of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges is unnecessary. Judges are already held accountable through performance evaluations, retention elections, oversight by a state judicial discipline commission, possible impeachment, and mandatory retirement at age 72. Further, Amendment 40 may discourage the best candidates from pursuing judgeships on the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Qualified lawyers will have to choose between continuing an established career or accepting a short-term position on the bench.
- 3) Amendment 40 removes judges regardless of their skills, accomplishments, or experience. It is essential for judges to understand particular areas of legal theory and how laws develop over time. This knowledge comes from years of serving on the court. With the limit on terms, judges will be required to step down when their experience is most beneficial to the court.

 Based on current terms, at least five of seven Supreme Court justices and seven of nineteen Court of Appeals judges will leave office on January 13, 2009. Replacement justices and judges may need time to receive training in judicial procedure and to review pending cases, which could create a case backlog and increase workload for agencies working in the court system. Any case backlog will depend on the number of appeals filed and the number of cases resolved during the next two years. It is estimated that if additional resources are needed, they will be requested during the annual budget process.

Note to Staff: Under "Arguments For," we request that the first and third paragraphs be switched as shown, in addition to the change of text in (old) lines 20-23. Under "Arguments Against," we request that the (old) first sentence of 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph be moved into middle paragraph as shown—boldface type calls attention to this – in addition to the proposed new language in small caps.

Thank you – John Andrews & Kathleen LeCrone, Proponents

#### 7 Arguments For

- 1) 3) TERM LIMITS ARE A CHECK AGAINST THE ABUSE OF JUDICIAL POWER, WHICH CONCERNS MANY CITIZENS TODAY. ADDITIONALLY, BY CREATING MORE TURNOVER IN OFFICE, TERM LIMITS WILL provide more opportunities for other judges to serve on the two highest courts. Voters have already limited the number of years that elected officials in the legislative and executive branches may serve; Amendment 40 applies term limits to the highest officials in the judicial branch as well.
- 2) The current options available to remove a judge from office are inadequate. No Supreme Court justice or Court of Appeals judge in Colorado has ever been removed by the voters in a retention election. Further, impeachment of judges is almost never used, and there is no process to recall a judge. As a result, judges can essentially serve as long as they want up until the mandatory retirement age. Amendment 40 ensures that after an appellate judge's initial two-year term, he or she does not remain in office longer than eight more years.
- 3) 1) Judges on Colorado's two highest courts should be evaluated more frequently than every eight to ten years. Requiring appellate judges to stand for retention every four years allows the public to hold these judges accountable for their actions and decisions more often. All other judges in Colorado stand for retention every four to six years; Amendment 40 will make the terms of appellate judges more similar to the other courts.

#### **Arguments Against**

- 1) Amendment 40 removes judges regardless of their skills, accomplishments, or experience. It is essential for judges to understand particular areas of legal theory and how laws develop over time. This knowledge comes from years of serving on the court. With the limit on terms, judges will not have adequate time to gain this experience.
- 2) Limiting the terms of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges is unnecessary. Judges are already held accountable through performance evaluations, retention elections, oversight by a state judicial discipline commission, possible impeachment, and mandatory retirement at age 72. Further, Amendment 40 may discourage the best candidates from pursuing judgeships on the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Qualified lawyers will have to choose between continuing an established career or accepting a short-term position on the bench.
- 3) Since this proposal ends the terms of judges in January 2009 who have served ten years or more, the next governor would appoint at least five Supreme Court justices and seven Court of Appeals judges. Therefore, one political party will appoint a substantial number of judges to the

state's two highest courts, including a majority of the justices of the Supreme Court. Every ten years THEREAFTER, DEPENDING ON THE TENURE OF INDIVIDUALS, one governor MAY AGAIN will have the ability to appoint a large number of judges to the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Further, some judges will be forced to leave office before completing the full term that the voters previously gave them.

## Colorado Bar Association

## Amendment 40 Term Limits for Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Judges

#### Amendment 40 proposes a change to the Colorado Constitution that:

- limits the number of terms that Colorado Supreme Court justices and Court of Appeals judges, called appellate court judges, may serve;
- reduces the term of Supreme Court justices from ten years to four years, and of Court of Appeals judges from eight years to four years;
- requires appellate court judges who have already served ten years or more to leave their current position in January 2009; and
- requires appellate court judges who are eligible to serve another term to appear on the November 2008 ballot for retention.

#### **Summary and Analysis**

The Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. The Colorado Supreme Court consists of seven justices who serve ten-year terms. The Colorado Court of Appeals consists of nineteen judges who serve eight-year terms. When a vacancy occurs on either of these courts, an appointed commission selects three nominees for consideration by the governor. The governor then appoints one of the three nominees to fill the vacancy.

What happens after a judge is appointed? After appointment, appellate judges serve an initial two-year term and then stand for retention at the next general election. At a retention election, voters vote to either keep a judge in office or to remove a judge from office. If voters choose to keep the judge in office, he or she serves an additional term before standing for retention again. There is currently no limit on the number of terms a judge can serve, but judges are required to retire at age 72.

How does Amendment 40 change the current system? Amendment 40 limits Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges to three terms – one initial two-year term plus two four-year terms. Appellate judges who, as of the November 2008 election, have already served ten years will not be eligible to serve another term in their current position. Judges who are eligible to continue serving will appear on the November 2008 ballot for retention.

#### **Arguments For**

- 1) Amendment 40 limits the number of years that a judge can influence the decisions of the state's two highest courts. By creating more turnover in office, it provides new perspectives and more opportunity for other judges to serve on the state's two highest courts. Voters have already limited the number of terms that elected officials in the legislative and executive branches may serve; Amendment 40 applies term limits to the highest officials in the judicial branch as well.
- 2) The current options available to remove a judge from office are inadequate. No Supreme Court justice or Court of Appeals judge in Colorado has ever been removed by voters in a retention election. Further, impeachment of judges is almost never used, and there is no process to recall a judge. As a result, judges can essentially serve as long as they want up until the mandatory retirement age. Amendment 40 ensures that after an appellate judge's initial two-year term, he or she does not serve more than eight additional years in that position.
- 3) Judges on Colorado's two highest courts should be held accountable more frequently than every eight to ten years. Requiring appellate judges to stand for retention every four years allows the public to evaluate the performance and decisions of these judges more often. All other judges in Colorado stand for retention every four to six years; Amendment 40 will make the terms of appellate judges more similar to the other courts.

#### **Arguments Against**

1) Amendment 40 will force five current Supreme Court justices and seven Court of Appeals judges from office in January 2009. Some of these judges will be leaving office before serving the full term that voters previously approved. In 2009, the governor will appoint new judges to the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, including a majority of the justices of the Supreme Court. This means that in 2009, one political party will have substantial DISPROPORTIONATE influence over the membership of the state's two highest courts. Further, every ten years thereafter, the governor may have the ability to appoint a large number MAJORITY of the judges to these two courts.



- 2) Limiting the terms of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges is unnecessary. Judges are already held accountable through performance evaluations, retention elections, oversight by a state judicial discipline commission, possible impeachment, and mandatory retirement at age 72. Further, Amendment 40 may discourage the best candidates from pursuing judgeships on the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Qualified lawyers will have to choose between continuing an established career or accepting a short-term position on the bench.
- 3) Amendment 40 removes judges regardless of their skills, accomplishments, or experience. It is essential for judges to understand particular areas of legal theory and how laws develop over time. This knowledge comes from years of serving on the court. With the limit on terms, judges will be required to step down when their experience is most beneficial to the court.

Based on current terms, at least five of seven Supreme Court justices and seven of nineteen Court of Appeals judges will leave office on January 13, 2009. Replacement justices and judges may need time to receive training in judicial procedure and to review pending cases, which could create a case backlog and increase workload for agencies working in the court system. Any case backlog will depend on the number of appeals filed and the number of cases resolved during the next two years. It is estimated that if additional resources are needed, they will be requested during the annual budget process.

#### **Arguments For**

- 1) Judges on Colorado's two highest courts should be evaluated more frequently than every eight to ten years. Requiring appellate judges to stand for retention every four years allows the public to hold these judges accountable for their actions and decisions more often. All other judges in Colorado stand for retention every four to six years; Amendment 40 will make the terms of appellate judges more similar to the other courts.
- 2) The current options available to remove a judge from office are inadequate. No Supreme Court justice or Court of Appeals judge in Colorado has ever been removed by the voters in a retention election. Further, impeachment of judges is almost never used, and there is no process to recall a judge. As a result, judges can essentially serve as long as they want up until the mandatory retirement age. Amendment 40 ensures that after an appellate judge's initial two-year term, he or she does not remain in office longer than eight more years.
- 3) Term limits create more turnover in office, and thus provide more opportunities for other judges to serve on the two highest courts. Voters have already limited the number of years that elected officials in the legislative and executive branches may serve; Amendment 40 applies term limits to the highest officials in the judicial branch as well.

#### **Arguments Against**

- 1) This will make the process more political because e Every ten years, one governor will have the ability to appoint a large number of judges to the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Since this proposal is retroactive, ends the terms of judges in January 2009 who have served ten years or more, the next governor would appoint at least five Supreme Court justices and seven Court of Appeals judges. Therefore, one political party will appoint a substantial number of judges to the state's two highest courts, including a majority of the justices of the Supreme Court. Further, some judges will be forced to leave office before completing the full term that the voters previously gave them.
- 2) Limiting the terms of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges is unnecessary. Judges are already held accountable through performance evaluations, retention elections, oversight by a state judicial discipline commission, possible impeachment, and mandatory retirement at age 72. Further, Amendment 40 may discourage the best candidates from pursuing judgeships on

the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Qualified lawyers will have to choose between continuing an established career or accepting a short-term position on the bench.

3) Amendment 40 removes judges regardless of their skills, accomplishments, or experience. It is essential for judges to understand particular areas of legal theory and how laws develop over time. This knowledge comes from years of serving on the court. With the limit on terms, judges will not have adequate time to gain this experience.

#### **Estimate of Fiscal Impact**

As a result of Amendment 40, at least five of seven Supreme Court justices and seven of nineteen Court of Appeals judges will leave office on January 13, 2009. Replacement justices and judges will need time to receive training in judicial procedure and review pending cases, which could create a case backlog and increase workload for agencies working in the court system. Any case backlog will depend on the number of appeals filed and the number of cases resolved during the next two years. It is estimated that if additional resources are needed, they will be requested during the annual budget process.

### Second Draft Mailed to Interested Parties

# Amendment 40 Term Limits for Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Judges

1 Amend	ment 40 is a	proposed	amendment to	the (	Colorado	Constitution th	ıat:
---------	--------------	----------	--------------	-------	----------	-----------------	------

•	limits the number of terms that appellate court judges - Colorado Supreme
	Court justices and Court of Appeals judges – may serve;

- reduces the term of Supreme Court justices from ten years to four years, and of Court of Appeals judges from eight years to four years;
- requires appellate court judges who have already served ten years or more to leave their current position in January 2009; and
  - requires appellate court judges who are eligible to serve another term to appear on the November 2008 ballot for retention.

#### **Summary and Analysis**

The Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. The Colorado Supreme Court consists of seven justices who serve ten-year terms. The Colorado Court of Appeals consists of nineteen judges who serve eight-year terms. When a vacancy occurs on either of these courts, an appointed commission selects three nominees to forward to the Governor. The Governor then appoints one of the three nominees to fill the vacancy.

What happens after a judge is appointed? After appointment, appellate judges serve an initial two-year term and then stand for retention at the next general election. At a retention election, voters vote to either keep a judge in office or to remove a judge from office. If voters choose to keep the judge in office, he or she serves an additional term before standing for retention again. There is currently no limit on the number of times a judge can seek retention, but judges are required to retire at age 72.

How does Amendment 40 change the current system? Amendment 40 limits
Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges to three terms – one initial two-year term plus
two four-year terms. Any appellate judge who, as of the November 2008 election, has
already served ten years will not be eligible to serve another term in their current position.
Judges who are eligible to continue serving will appear on the November 2008 ballot for
retention.

#### **Arguments For**

- 1) Judges on Colorado's two highest courts should be evaluated more frequently than every eight to ten years. Requiring appellate judges to stand for retention every four years allows the public to hold these judges accountable for their actions and decisions more often. All other judges in Colorado stand for retention every four to six years; Amendment 40 will make the terms of appellate judges more similar to the other courts.
- 2) The current options available to remove a judge from office are inadequate. No Supreme Court justice or Court of Appeals judge in Colorado has ever been removed by the voters in a retention election. Further, impeachment of judges is almost never used, and there is no process to recall a judge. As a result, judges can essentially serve as long as they want up until the mandatory retirement age. Amendment 40 ensures that after an appellate judge's initial two-year term, he or she does not remain in office longer than eight more years.
- 3) Term limits create more turnover in office, and thus provide more opportunities for other judges to serve on the two highest courts. Voters have already limited the number of years that elected officials in the legislative and executive branches may serve; Amendment 40 applies term limits to the highest officials in the judicial branch as well.

#### **Arguments Against**

1) Amendment 40 removes judges regardless of their skills, accomplishments, or experience. It is essential for judges to understand particular areas of legal theory and how laws develop over time. This knowledge comes from years of serving on the court. With the limit on terms, judges will not have adequate time to gain this experience.

- 2) Limiting the terms of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals judges is unnecessary. Judges are already held accountable through performance evaluations, retention elections, oversight by a state judicial discipline commission, possible impeachment, and mandatory retirement at age 72. Further, Amendment 40 may discourage the best candidates from pursuing judgeships on the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Qualified lawyers will have to choose between continuing an established career or accepting a short-term position on the bench.
- 3) Every ten years, one governor will have the ability to appoint a large number of judges to the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Since this proposal ends the terms of judges in January 2009 who have served ten years or more, the next governor would appoint at least five Supreme Court justices and seven Court of Appeals judges. Therefore, one political party will appoint a substantial number of judges to the state's two highest courts, including a majority of the justices of the Supreme Court. Further, some judges will be forced to leave office before completing the full term that the voters previously gave them.

As a result of Amendment 40, at least five of seven Supreme Court justices and seven of nineteen Court of Appeals judges will leave office on January 13, 2009. Replacement justices and judges will need time to receive training in judicial procedure and review pending cases, which could create a case backlog and increase workload for agencies working in the court system. Any case backlog will depend on the number of appeals filed and the number of cases resolved during the next two years. It is estimated that if additional resources are needed, they will be requested during the annual budget process.

# AMENDMENT 40 TERM LIMITS FOR SUPREME COURT AND COURT OF APPEALS JUDGES CONTACT LIST

April Washington

washingtonam@rockymountainnews.com

Becky Updike

Colorado Judicial Institute

303-766-7501

Becky.Updike@ColoradoJudicialInstitute.org

Chris Ryan

Office of State Court Administrator

1300 Penn. Street Denver, CO 80203

christopher.ryan@judicial.state.co.us

Cindy Sovine

Cindy@fsfconsulting.com

Coleen Slevin

cslevin@ap.org

Craig Hughes Ridder/Braden, Inc.

1900 Grant St., Suite 1170

Denver, CO 80203

craig@ridder-braden.com

David Kribs

Office of the State Court Administrator

1301 Penn. Street Denver, CO 80203

david.kribs@judicial.state.co.us

Faye Diamond Ridder/Braden, Inc.

1900 Grant St., Suite 1170

Denver, CO 80203 303-832-2444

faye@rbistrategies.com

Gale Miller

Colorado Judicial Institute

303-766-7501

gale.miller@dgslaw.com

Greg Martin

gmartin@cobar.org

H. Lawrence Hoyt

P.O. Box 471 Boulder, CO 80306

303-441-3190

lhoyt@co.boulder.co.us

James M. Lyons

Rothgerber Johnson & Lyons 1200 17th St., Suite 3000

Denver, CO 80202

303-628-9546

ilyons@rothgerber.com

Jean Dubofsky

303-447-3510

jeandubofsky@comcast.net

John Fryar

jfryar@times-call.com

John Andrews

8547 E. Arapahoe Rd. PMB J122

Englewood, CO 80112

303-770-8215

andrewsjk@aol.com

John E. Moye

Moye/White

1400 16th St., 6th Floor Denver, CO 80202-1473

303-292-7900

john.moye@moyewhite.com

# AMENDMENT 40 TERM LIMITS FOR SUPREME COURT AND COURT OF APPEALS JUDGES CONTACT LIST

Kathleen A. LeCrone 4371 S. Fundy Street Aurora, CO 80015

Senator Ken Gordon ken@kengordon.com

Madelyn Dellere mdellere@wb2.com

Marjorie Fisch League of Women Voters 1410 Grant St., Suite B-204 Denver, CO 80203 303-322-4235 ralphmarj@msn.com

Mark Breen mbreen@wb2.com

Mark G. Grueskin Isaacson Rosenbaum Woods & Levy P.C. 633 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2200 Denver, CO 80202 303-292-5656 mgrueskin@ir-law.com

Mary Dilworth mdilworth@cobar.org

Michael Valdez Colorado Bar Association 303-824-5309 mavaldez@cobar.org

Mike Monkman OSPB State Capitol Building, Room 111 Denver, CO 80203 303-866-2628 mike.monkman@state.co.us

Morgan Carroll morgancarroll@webaccess.net

Richard Gabriel Colorado Judicial Institute 303-766-7501 richard.gabriel@hro.com Rick Randall rrandall@richardrandall.com

Rick Ridder Ridder/Braden, Inc. 1900 Grant St., Suite 1170 Denver, CO 80203 rick@rbistrategies.com Sherry Kester
Judicial Department
1301 Pennsylvania Ave, Suite 300
Denver, CO 80203
sherry.kester@judicial.state.co.us

Stacy Chesney schesney@cobar.org

Tara Trujillo tara.trujillo@state.co.us

## Amendment 40 - Term Limits for Supreme Court and Court of Appeals Judges

Ballot Title: An amendment to the Colorado constitution concerning term limits for appellate court judges, and, in connection therewith, reducing the terms of office for justices of the supreme court and judges of the court of appeals to four years, requiring appellate judges serving as of January 1, 2007, to stand for retention at the next general election, if eligible for another term, prohibiting an appellate judge from serving more than three terms, specifying that a provisional term constitutes a full term, and making any appellate judge who has served ten or more years at one court level ineligible for another term at that level.

#### Text of Proposal:

9

- 10 Be it Enacted by the People of the State of Colorado:
- 11 Section 1. Article VI of the constitution of the state of Colorado is amended by the
- addition of a new section to read:
- Section 27. Terms of office and term limits. Effective January 1, 2007,
- 14 TERMS OF OFFICE FOR APPEALS COURT JUDGES AND SUPREME COURT JUSTICES SHALL BE
- 15 FOUR YEARS. INCUMBENTS AS OF THAT DATE SHALL STAND FOR RETENTION AT THE NEXT
- 16 GENERAL ELECTION, IF ELIGIBLE FOR ANOTHER TERM AT THAT LEVEL. AT EACH
- 17 APPELLATE COURT LEVEL, NO ONE SHALL SERVE MORE THAN THREE TERMS OF OFFICE.
- A PROVISIONAL TERM SHALL BE A TERM OF OFFICE. ANYONE WHO HAS SERVED TEN
- 19 YEARS OR MORE AT ONE APPELLATE COURT LEVEL SHALL NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR ANOTHER
- 20 TERM AT THAT LEVEL.
- 21 Section 2. Repeal. Section 7 of Article VI of the constitution of the state of Colorado
- 22 is repealed as follows:
- Section 7. Term of office. The full term of office of justices of the Supreme
- 24 Court shall be ten years.