# COLORADO JUSTICE 2030

Executive Brief: A Report and Proposal to the Colorado Supreme Court

Prepared by Ronald Lewis, citizen proponent, Lakewood, Colorado. Day One Policy Lab, October 2026.

## The record

**Delay.** A defendant challenging a felony conviction waited an average of 1,077 days from filing to a Court of Appeals opinion in fiscal year 2023, improving to 842 days in fiscal year 2024. The time sits in record preparation, transcripts, and extensions, not in filing volume. The National Center for State Courts found record preparation is the longest stage of a Colorado appeal, against a national model standard of 75 percent of appeals resolved within 450 days.

**Error.** Colorado has at least eleven documented exonerations, including imprisonments of ten, thirteen, and seventeen years. The Colorado Bureau of Investigation's completed internal review counts 1,003 cases impacted by one analyst's manipulation of DNA testing data, after internal concerns raised in 2014 went unacted upon for nine years.

## The proposal: four pillars

- **1. End long litigation periods.** Adopt appellate time standards by rule; decouple transcripts from the clerk's record under C.A.R. 10(c) with milestone tracking and staged escalation; discipline extensions under C.A.R. 26; pilot verified digital transcription in two districts.
- **2. Decrease wrongful determinations.** A signing duty certifying verification of citations in filings; a confidential, discipline-firewalled error-reporting and learning system; forensic quality disclosure to courts and parties; published counts of cases resolved at procedural gates, with plain-language cure notices.
- **3. Improve workflows.** A public timeliness and accuracy dashboard on the Branch's existing dashboard program; a secure internal AI platform for court staff, deployed with training on the New Jersey model; plain-language summaries of orders for self-represented litigants, 76 percent of the people in Colorado domestic relations cases in fiscal year 2025.
- **4. Build a stronger justice system.** A court-adopted governance standard for AI in court operations, on the model of California Rule 10.43; an annual State of the Judiciary data report; a standing evaluation function so no pilot becomes permanent without published results.

## The reimagination (Part III)

An integrated AI layer across the criminal docket: constitutional risks flagged to the court and to all parties while they can still be cured; a verified case map for the deciding judge; validated error signatures swept across closed and pending cases in days; real-time plain-language warnings when a filing risks forfeiting an issue; and the system's own sentencing, revocation, and gate patterns published in aggregate. Every output is advisory, disclosed, logged in an auditable ledger, and disposed of by a human. The components operate abroad today (Brazil, Argentina, Colombia, Singapore); the integration is new.

## Method and the ask

Every figure in the full report traces to a verification register enclosed with the submission; figures that could not be verified are not asserted. Operational proposals are pilots with pre-registered metrics and stop conditions. The governing principle throughout: artificial intelligence may assist, but it is never an unreviewable substitute for human judgment, and adjudication is never delegated. The Court is asked to refer the rule proposals to its rules committees, the AI proposals to the Legal Technology Advisory Committee, and the measurement baseline to the State Court Administrator, and to publish any advanced item for public comment in the ordinary course.