

Mr. Richardson:

I did not expect your paper to print my letter as your modus operandi is to name call and criticize without accepting criticism of your own method of reporting which is not, for the most part, reporting at all but rather opinion and innuendo. I have no issue with criticisms of judges and the judicial system, only with the unprofessional manner in which they are made. Though I am the executive director of the Colorado Trial Lawyers Association, as you point out, I wrote the letter on behalf of our Crestmoor Park (2nd Filing) Board which is made up of attorneys and non-attorneys. All agreed with the content of the letter. Semantically speaking, whether you called her a “pro corruption judge” or a “corrupt judge,” the innuendo is the same and you know that. Lastly, you write “ Our reporters went to the hearing and were shocked by her bias and lack of professionalism.” The same can easily be said about your paper and your stories. It is the type of hatred and sensationalism, that you espouse in your paper, not just around this story, but around many other stories, that has contributed to make the political climate what it is today. A climate of hate, innuendo, and intolerance.

Speaking now for your accusations against CTLA that CTLA has stood in the way of judicial reform. We support judicial reform that makes the courts accessible to consumers and those that have been harmed by the negligence of others. In fact, I really don't know what opposition to judicial reform you are referring to. Maybe you could be more specific as to what judicial reform we have opposed. Of course we are opposed to any legislation or rule that makes access to the courthouse more costly or difficult for consumers. If your claim is that we are opposed to judicial reform because we don't call for the resignation of judges that issue rulings that we don't agree with, then that would be correct. There is a process in place to review those rulings and it is called the appellate process. There is also a process in place to evaluate judges and make recommendations as to their retention. Though that system may not be perfect, it does have some semblance of objectivity. Could it be improved? Obviously, and if we see a proposal that would actually do so, we would support it. I have the opportunity to meet with my counterparts around the country and I do not envy those that elect their judges. The amount of money those associations must raise for those races and, the conflicts of interest associated with that fundraising, makes that a system that we would not advocate for.

I also disagree with Judge Gilman's ruling but I choose to do so respectfully and will wait to allow the process to continue in the appellate courts as Mr. Kerwin has filed a notice of appeal. I appreciate your sharing my original letter via website as obviously it was so well written that it was not possible to edit it for length and publication. I apologize, in advance, for any misspellings. I will be happy to share your response with my “distinguished” Crestmoor Board.

John Sadwith
President
Crestmoor Park (2nd Filing) Homes Association