First Regular Session Seventy-first General Assembly STATE OF COLORADO

INTRODUCED

LLS NO. 17-0711.01 Bob Lackner x4350

HOUSE BILL 17-1177

HOUSE SPONSORSHIP

Wist and Garnett,

SENATE SPONSORSHIP

Cooke,

101102

103

House Committees State, Veterans, & Military Affairs

Senate Committees

A DILL FOR AN ACT
CONCERNING THE USE OF ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF RESOLVING
DISPUTES THAT ARISE UNDER THE "COLORADO OPEN RECORDS
ACT".

A DILL EOD AN ACT

Bill Summary

(Note: This summary applies to this bill as introduced and does not reflect any amendments that may be subsequently adopted. If this bill passes third reading in the house of introduction, a bill summary that applies to the reengrossed version of this bill will be available at http://leg.colorado.gov.)

Commencing on the effective date of the bill, any person denied the right to inspect documents under the "Colorado Open Records Act" (CORA) or who alleges other CORA violations may apply to the state district court in which the record is located for an appropriate order. The bill also permits the parties in good faith to participate in mediation to resolve their dispute.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

The bill provides immunity for the disclosure of privileged or confidential information to the mediator.

The bill specifies requirements and procedures governing the mediation, including situations where:

- The party disputing the custodian's decision has chosen not to participate in the mediation before seeking a district court order;
- ! The parties participated in mediation but were unable to resolve their dispute without filing a court order; and
- ! The parties did not participate in mediation.
- 1 Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado:
- SECTION 1. In Colorado Revised Statutes, 24-72-204, amend

 (5) as follows:
 - 24-72-204. Allowance or denial of inspection grounds procedure - appeal - definitions. (5) (a) Except as provided in subsection (5.5) of this section, any person denied the right to inspect any record covered by this part 2 may apply to the district court of the district wherein the record is found for an order directing the custodian of such record to show cause why the custodian should not permit the inspection of such record; except that, at least three business days prior to filing an application with the district court, the person who has been denied the right to inspect the record shall file PROVIDE a written notice with TO the custodian who has denied the right to inspect the record informing said custodian that the person intends to file an application with the district court. A hearing on such application shall MUST be held at the earliest practical time. Unless the court finds that the denial of the right of inspection was proper, it shall order the custodian to permit such inspection and shall award court costs and reasonable attorney fees to the prevailing applicant in an amount to be determined by the court; except

-2- HB17-1177

that no court costs and attorney fees shall be awarded to a person who has filed a lawsuit against a state public body or local public body and who applies to the court for an order pursuant to this subsection (5) for access to records of the state public body or local public body being sued if the court finds that the records being sought are related to the pending litigation and are discoverable pursuant to chapter 4 of the Colorado rules of civil procedure. In the event the court finds that the denial of the right of inspection was proper, the court shall award court costs and reasonable attorney fees to the custodian if the court finds that the action was frivolous, vexatious, or groundless.

- (b) Commencing on the effective date of this subsection (5)(b), any person denied the right to inspect any record or who alleges a violation of the fee provisions of subsection (5)(a) of this section may apply to the district court of the district in which the record is located for an appropriate order subject to the following:
- (I) THE PARTIES MAY IN GOOD FAITH PARTICIPATE IN MEDIATION REGARDING THE DISPUTE AND EVENLY SPLIT THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE MEDIATION PROCESS; OR
- (II) IF THE PARTY DISPUTING THE CUSTODIAN'S DECISION HAS CHOSEN NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN MEDIATION BEFORE SEEKING A DISTRICT COURT ORDER, THE PARTY SHALL PROVIDE TO THE CUSTODIAN WRITTEN NOTICE OF THE PARTY'S INTENT TO SUE NOT LESS THAN THREE BUSINESS DAYS BEFORE FILING A COMPLAINT. THE CUSTODIAN MAY RESPOND TO THE NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUE IN WRITING BY PROPOSING THAT THE PARTIES MEDIATE AND EVENLY SPLIT THE ASSOCIATED MEDIATION COSTS.
 - (c) EITHER PARTY TO THE MEDIATION MAY BRING AN ACTION IN

-3- HB17-1177

1	STATE DISTRICT COURT TO ENFORCE A MEDIATION AGREEMENT WHERE THE
2	AGREEMENT IS IN WRITING AND HAS BEEN EXECUTED BY BOTH PARTIES.
3	(d) IN ANY ACTION IN WHICH THE PARTIES PARTICIPATE IN
4	MEDIATION, AND THE MEDIATOR DETERMINES THERE IS A LEGAL QUESTION
5	OF WHETHER A DISCLOSURE OF THE RECORD IS PROHIBITED PURSUANT TO
6	THIS PART 2, THE MEDIATOR MAY ORDER THE CUSTODIAN TO APPLY TO THE
7	DISTRICT COURT IN WHICH SUCH RECORD IS LOCATED FOR THE COURT TO
8	DETERMINE WHETHER DISCLOSURE IS PROHIBITED. THE ATTORNEY FEE
9	PROVISIONS OF SUBSECTION (5)(e) OF THIS SECTION SHALL NOT APPLY IN
10	CASES BROUGHT PURSUANT TO THIS SUBSECTION $(5)(d)$.
11	(e) IN ANY ACTION IN WHICH THE PARTIES PARTICIPATED IN
12	MEDIATION BUT WERE UNABLE TO RESOLVE THEIR DISPUTE WITHOUT
13	RESORTING TO FILING A COURT ACTION UNDER THIS SECTION:
14	(I) IF THE COURT FINDS THE DENIAL OF THE RIGHT TO INSPECTION
15	WAS PROPER, THE COURT MAY AWARD COURT COSTS AND REASONABLE
16	ATTORNEY FEES TO THE CUSTODIAN; OR
17	(II) IF THE COURT FINDS THE DENIAL OF THE RIGHT TO INSPECTION
18	WAS NOT PROPER, THE COURT SHALL AWARD THE MEDIATION COSTS,
19	COURT COSTS, AND REASONABLE ATTORNEY FEES TO THE PREVAILING
20	APPLICANT IN AN AMOUNT TO BE DETERMINED BY THE COURT.
21	(f) IN ANY ACTION IN WHICH THE PARTIES DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN
22	MEDIATION:
23	(I) IF THE COURT FINDS THE DENIAL OF THE RIGHT TO INSPECTION
24	WAS PROPER, THE COURT SHALL AWARD COURT COSTS AND REASONABLE
25	ATTORNEY FEES TO THE CUSTODIAN IF THE COURT FINDS THE ACTION WAS
26	FRIVOLOUS, VEXATIOUS, OR GROUNDLESS;
27	(II) IF THE COURT FINDS THE DENIAL OF THE RIGHT TO INSPECTION

-4- HB17-1177

1	WAS NOT PROPER AND THE APPLICANT DID NOT REQUEST MEDIATION OR
2	REFUSED TO CONSENT TO MEDIATION WHEN REQUESTED BY THE
3	CUSTODIAN, THE COURT SHALL AWARD COURT COSTS AND REASONABLE
4	ATTORNEY FEES TO THE PREVAILING APPLICANT IN AN AMOUNT TO BE
5	DETERMINED BY THE COURT BUT NOT EXCEEDING TEN THOUSAND
6	DOLLARS; OR
7	(III) IF THE COURT FINDS THE DENIAL OF THE RIGHT TO INSPECTION
8	WAS NOT PROPER AND THE APPLICANT REQUESTED MEDIATION BUT THE
9	CUSTODIAN REFUSED TO CONSENT, THE COURT SHALL AWARD A PENALTY
10	TO THE APPLICANT IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED ONE HUNDRED
11	THOUSAND DOLLARS, IN ADDITION TO COURT COSTS AND REASONABLE
12	ATTORNEY FEES IN AN AMOUNT TO BE DETERMINED BY THE COURT.
13	(g) NOTWITHSTANDING ANY OTHER PROVISION OF LAW, IT SHALL
14	NOT CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF ANY EVIDENTIARY PRIVILEGE OR OTHER
15	CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENT RECOGNIZED IN LAW THAT IS OTHERWISE
16	APPLICABLE TO PUBLIC RECORDS SOUGHT TO BE INSPECTED PURSUANT TO
17	THIS PART 2 FOR A PARTY TO A MEDIATION CONDUCTED UNDER THIS
18	SECTION TO PROVIDE RECORDS CONTAINING CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION
19	TO A MEDIATOR FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONDUCTING THE MEDIATION.
20	(h) NOTWITHSTANDING ANY OTHER PROVISION OF THIS
21	SUBSECTION (5), THE COURT SHALL NOT AWARD COURT COSTS AND
22	REASONABLE ATTORNEY FEES AGAINST A CUSTODIAN IN ANY ACTION
23	BROUGHT UNDER SUBSECTION (6)(a) OF THIS SECTION.
24	SECTION 2. Act subject to petition - effective date. This act
25	takes effect at 12:01 a.m. on the day following the expiration of the
26	ninety-day period after final adjournment of the general assembly (August
27	9, 2017, if adjournment sine die is on May 10, 2017); except that, if a

-5- HB17-1177

- referendum petition is filed pursuant to section 1 (3) of article V of the
- state constitution against this act or an item, section, or part of this act
- 3 within such period, then the act, item, section, or part will not take effect
- 4 unless approved by the people at the general election to be held in
- November 2018 and, in such case, will take effect on the date of the
- 6 official declaration of the vote thereon by the governor.

-6- HB17-1177