# How New Real Estate Contracts Stop Fraud

Imagine writing a check for your absolute dream home, moving in, and then discovering that the Neighborhood Homeowners Association has the legal power to foreclose on your property over a $500 fine. Right, which is just a terrifying thought. It really is.

Or, you know, picture handing over your life savings for a million dollar condo deposit only to learn the broker holding your money just spent it on a personal vacation. Sadly, that actually happens. Yeah, it does.

These aren't just hypothetical nightmares. They are very real vulnerabilities in the legal paperwork of real estate. Absolutely.

And today we are looking at the invisible bureaucratic guardrails designed to stop those exact disasters from happening to you. Which is such an important topic. For sure.

So, just to set the stage, it's as of June of 2026. Right. We attended the stakeholder meetings and we're using our notes from those to take a way too early look at what changes might be coming to the Colorado contracts and forms for 2027.

Yeah, we should clarify that. Right, this is all still speculative since the Commission won't see these until at least the August meeting and perhaps October. Yeah.

But we do think we have a pretty good idea. That is the perfect way to frame it. And, you know, in this discussion we are going to be heavily focused on the DRE, the Division of Real Estate.

Exactly. And the Commission, since the Commission approves final forms and contract changes. Right.

When you sit through these marathon stakeholder meetings, I mean, you witness this massive complex tug-of-war. Totally. On one side you have regulators trying to engineer bulletproof consumer protections.

And then on the other side you have the day-to-day reality of how brokers actually operate out in the field. Okay, let's unpack this. Yeah.

Because to really understand where these local contracts are going, we actually have to start with, well, a federal pushdown. Yeah, we do. It is wild to see how a tiny semantic shift made by a federal agency in Washington DC immediately forces a very specific paperwork headache onto a real estate broker in, like, Denver or a Grand Junction.

It is a textbook example of regulatory trickle-down. So we were looking at the lead-based paint disclosures. For decades the real estate industry has operated under a very predictable rhythm regarding any residential property built before 1978.

Because of the lead paint risk. Exactly. The seller discloses what they know about lead paint, the buyer acknowledges it, and everyone just moves on.

Right, it's standard. But the EPA and HUD, the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, have recently revised how they define one specific word under federal law. Just one word.

Just one word. And that word is agent. Which, you know, on the surface sounds entirely harmless.

Oh, it does. But changing the definition of agent fundamentally shifts who is legally on the hook if something goes wrong. Absolutely.

So under the historical interpretation, the agent responsible for ensuring a seller complied with federal lead paint rules was simply the listing broker. The one representing the seller. Right.

But under the revised federal standard, if a buyer's broker is paid by the seller, or, you know, paid through a cooperative brokerage agreement with the listing broker. Which is incredibly common. Right.

It's extremely common. So if that happens, federal law now considers that buyer's broker to also be an agent for the purpose of the rule. Wow.

Yeah. This means the buyer's broker is now legally responsible for ensuring the seller complies with federal disclosure obligations. I mean, this sounds like getting a speeding ticket because the person driving the car next to you was going too fast.

That's a great way to put it. How can the DRE expect a buyer's broker to enforce a seller's behavior? A buyer's broker often has zero direct contact with the seller. Almost never.

Right. And they certainly don't control when the seller fills out their paperwork. And that mechanical disconnect, that was the core of the frustration that just boiled over during the stakeholder meetings.

I bet. Industry veterans stepped up to the microphone arguing that this pushes the entire process backward 15 years. Oh, wow.

Yeah. From a purely logistical standpoint, brokers were asking, how can a buyer's agent force a listing agent to provide the proper EPA pamphlets before an offer is even drafted? That's practically impossible. It puts the buyer at a severe competitive disadvantage.

Right. Because if I am trying to buy a house in a really hot market and my broker tells me, well, we have to wait for the listing agent to send over lead paint pamphlet before we can submit our offer. Another buyer is just going to step in.

Exactly. Another buyer who just ignores the rule is going to swoop in and win the bidding war. You are actively punishing the people trying to play by the rules.

What's fascinating here is the DRE completely understands that frustration. They do. They do.

They aren't inventing this rule in a vacuum just to create more red tape for local brokers. Okay. They are reacting to a really aggressive federal posture.

The DRE's entire goal with updating these 2027 forms is protective. Protecting the brokers. Exactly.

The EPA enforces this lead-based paint rule with fines of up to $10,000 or even $12,000 per single violation. Wow. So a broker closes, say, 50 homes a year and misses this technicality on half of them, they are looking at bankruptcy.

Precisely. If the state forms don't explicitly require the buyer's broker to initial a box acknowledging this new federal obligation, brokers will simply keep operating the way they always have. Because they won't know any better.

Right. They'll think they are in full compliance with state law only to get audited and absolutely hammered by the EPA. Oh man.

So the Commission is updating the forms so brokers are forced to confront this liability immediately rather than discovering it when a $12,000 federal fine shows up in the mail. That makes sense. Yeah.

It is a warning sign placed right before a federal cliff. So the state is stepping in to protect brokers from federal fines. Yes.

But what happens when the state has to protect buyers from the brokers themselves? Ah. Right. Because moving deeper into our discussion today, we run into the extremely blurry boundary of where a real estate broker's job legally ends and where a lawyer's job begins.

Yes. The unauthorized practice of law. Right.

This was easily one of the most contentious flashpoints in the meeting, specifically regarding the title-related objection notice. And there was this heavy debate over whether or not to create a brand new title resolution form. Well the DRE is proposing adding bold unmissable language to these forms, stating that brokers may only act as scriveners.

Right. Scriveners. Which, I love that word by the way.

It sounds like something out of medieval monastery. It really does have an archaic ring to it. But in legal terms, a scrivener is essentially just a scribe.

Like a human typewriter. Exactly. A human typewriter.

It dictates that the broker is only allowed to write down exactly what the client instructs them to write. Okay. They cannot independently interpret legal documents and they cannot prepare objections themselves based on their own legal analysis.

Here's where it gets really interesting. Okay. Let's say a broker is looking at a property survey with their buyer.

Right. And they can clearly see that the neighbor's fence is built three feet over the property line. A very common scenario.

Yeah. It's visibly obvious to anyone with eyes, why do they have to play dumb? I mean it's like seeing a typo in a book but being legally barred from handing the author an eraser. If we connect this to the bigger picture, you have to look at the catastrophic risk to the consumer if the broker gets it wrong.

Okay. Yes, a fence over a property line seems obvious. But interpreting a title commitment or drafting language to resolve a boundary dispute that is fundamentally the practice of law.

Because it's not just about the fence. Exactly. Title documents involve layered invisible complexities.

You're dealing with historical easements, severed mineral rights, and metropolitan districts. Which can be huge issues. Oh massive.

Metro districts are essentially hidden taxing authorities that can saddle a neighborhood with massive infrastructure debt. Wow. Right.

If a broker looks at a complex title exception and says, oh this looks standard to me, let's just accept it. They could be in trouble. Big trouble.

They might be accidentally waiving their clients rights to their own driveway or agreeing to a crushing future tax burden. So a well-meaning broker, you know, just trying to save their client a few hundred dollars on an attorney might accidentally cost them the entire property. Exactly.

And that's why the DRE draws a hard line. Because a real estate license does not grant you the expertise to untangle property law. Right.

Now to be fair to the brokers, restricting their ability to draft these resolutions is causing massive anxiety in rural areas. Because it's different out there. Very different.

We heard compelling testimony from brokers handling vacant land, farms, and ranches. Where the transactions look very different from a standard suburban house sale. Extremely different.

In rural markets, owner carry notes are incredibly common. That's seller financing, right? Yes. Exactly.

Where instead of a bank giving the buyer a mortgage, the seller acts as the bank and finances the property directly. Got it. Brokers in those markets argue they are very comfortable using commission-approved deeds of trust and promissory notes to facilitate these deals.

Because they do it all the time. Right. So taking these forms away or overly restricting a broker's ability to fill them out forces rural consumers into a really tough spot.

What are their options then? Well, they either have to hire expensive legal counsel or worse, they try to do it themselves by downloading unregulated dangerous contracts off the internet. Which sounds like a recipe for disaster. And even when attorneys do get involved, it creates this bizarre intellectual property clash with the Commission's forms, doesn't it? Yeah, that is the other layer of this debate.

The standardized forms are strictly copyrighted by the Commission. Okay. There is a specific regulation, Rule 7.2, which dictates exactly how and when a broker can modify a standard form.

Just to keep things consistent. Exactly. This ensures everyone in the transaction knows what they are signing.

But attorneys are governed by the Supreme Court, not the DRE. Oh, right. So you have this friction where an attorney might take a Commission copyrighted form, completely rewrite massive sections of it to favor their specific client, and then hand it back to the broker to use.

Which completely destroys the mechanism of having a standardized form in the first place. Completely. If the other party assumes they are reading the standard boilerplate language, they might sign it without realizing a major liability clause was secretly gutted.

Exactly. I mean, it's like taking someone else's patented engine, tweaking one gear to make it run differently, and then trying to sell it as the original car. That is a great way to visualize it.

And it raised a very serious question in the meetings. Is an attorney heavily modifying a Commission-approved form actually committing intellectual property infringement? Wow, I never thought of that. Yeah, the DRE is currently conferring with the Attorney General's Office to figure out the exact legal boundaries of that copyright.

That'll be interesting. But the overarching theme remains, brokers facilitate transactions, they do not practice law. Right.

So the state is cracking down on brokers accidentally jeopardizing property rights. Yes. But sometimes the threat to the buyer's property rights isn't a bad legal interpretation, it's the neighborhood itself.

Right. Which brings us to the new proposed HOA disclosure form. Yes, this one is huge.

This form was entirely born out of a homeowner rights task force from a few years ago, and its entire mechanical purpose is to act as a financial wake-up call before a buyer signs on the dotted line. And based on the testimony, buyers desperately need that wake-up call. They really do.

We heard from Connie Van Dorn, a homeowner advocate, who pointed out that most buyers treat homeowners associations as an afterthought. Totally. They look at the community pool, they see the pristine landscaping, and they just don't realize the legal teeth hiding in the bylaws.

Yeah, they see the amenities, but they don't grasp the enforcement mechanisms. Right. Van Dorn shared anecdotes of homeowners spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in private legal fees just fighting their own HOAs.

That's insane. In one specific case, it was over a million dollars. Just to fight the board of your own neighborhood? Exactly.

Because an HOA isn't just a friendly neighborhood watch. No, it's not. It is a privately run, mandatory, legal, and financial obligation attached to the dirt itself.

Wow. So the proposed new form explicitly outlines how an HOA actually functions. It warns buyers, in plain English, that HOAs have the power to fine you for arbitrary infractions.

Like leaving your trash can out. Right. They can unilaterally raise your monthly assessments, they can levy special assessments, meaning if the clubhouse roof caves in, they can suddenly demand a massive lump sum from every homeowner.

Ouch. And crucially, if you don't pay, they can put a lien on your house and foreclose on it to satisfy the debt. That drastically shifts the narrative.

I mean, it goes from, here are the rules about what color you can paint your mailbox, to here is an entity that can legally take your house and sell it at auction. Exactly. And the form specifically warns buyers that if a dispute happens, the HOA's attorneys are paid to represent the HOA, not you.

Ooh, that's a key point. Yeah. If you want to fight a fine or a foreclosure, you have to go through the court system entirely at your own private expense.

It's essentially a financial surgeon general's warning label. That's perfectly said. And we are seeing that exact same spirit of hyper-specific consumer warning in how brokers disclose their own conflicts of interest.

You're referring to the proposed shift with Commission Position 22, known as CP22. Exactly. Historically, this rule required a broker to provide full disclosure of the risks involved if a conflict of interest existed in a transaction.

Okay. The proposal changes that mandatory language to providing specific examples of potential risks. Which, I have to admit, initially sounds like a downgrade.

A lot of people think so. Yeah, why would regulators move from demanding full disclosure to just giving a few specific examples? Because legally, full disclosure is an impossible standard to meet. How so? The mechanism of the rule was broken.

I mean, how can a broker possibly predict and disclose every single thing that could conceivably go wrong in the future? Right. Under a literal interpretation of full disclosure, a broker might technically have to warn you that an asteroid could hit the house, or that the previous owner's ghost might be a conflict of interest. It's a legal standard that demands a crystal ball.

That's right. And because it's impossible if you miss one obscure, one-in-a-million risk, you are technically in violation of your licensing requirements. That's rough.

By changing the requirement to specific examples, the DRE is forcing the broker to abandon a blanket, generic checkbox, and actually tailor the warning to the client's unique situation. Like explaining exactly how a pending bankruptcy might impact the sale. Exactly.

Making it practical rather than theoretical. Speaking of practical mechanics though, we need to dive into the debate over property management fee disclosures. Oh yes.

Because this is where I start to feel like the DRE is stuck in a different century. You're talking about the strict rules on how property managers notify landlords about fee increases. Yes.

The DRE is holding a very hard line that property managers cannot just post a notification of a fee change on a website or, you know, provide a link in a portal. Right. They are demanding direct notification like physical mail, direct email, or phone calls giving the owner an active chance to cancel their contract.

That's the proposal. And I just think in 2026 we check our bank balances online, we read our news online, we manage our lives in portals. Why is the DRE treating an online link like it's a message in a bottle? Well the DRE's stance isn't an anti-technology bias.

No. No, it is about the legal definition of informed consent. Okay, explain that.

Consumers hire a property manager specifically to create a passive investment experience. They pay a percentage of their rent precisely so they do not have to check a property management portal every single day. I hear that.

But practically speaking, if they mail me a physical notice and I just toss it in the recycling bin with the rest of my junk mail without reading it? Yeah. Isn't that just as passive? How does the DRE justify the difference between a letter I don't open and a website I don't check? It really comes down to the mechanism of discovery. Okay.

With a website portal, the consumer has to take an active step to go hunt for the information. They have to log in and navigate to a fee schedule. With direct mail or a direct email, the manager has pushed the information directly into the consumer's hands.

Discarding a letter requires an action to ignore it. A website requires an action to discover it. Ah, I see the distinction.

You cannot trap someone in a fee increase just because they didn't intuitively know to click a link hidden in the footer of a digital monthly newsletter. Altering a financial contract requires an active opportunity for the consumer to opt out. Okay, that actually makes a lot of sense when you frame it like that.

We've been talking about all these meticulous forms, these boundary lines, and these invisible guardrails the DRE builds to protect consumers. Yeah. But there is a parallel conversation happening right now in the state legislature about tearing those exact guardrails down.

Yes, the Sunset Bill. Right. In Colorado, regulatory agencies routinely go through a legislative sunset review to determine if they should continue to exist and what their statutory powers should be.

Currently, industry lobbyists are heavily pushing amendments to the DRE Sunset Bill that would drastically reduce the Commission's authority to protect the public. What specific mechanisms are they trying to strip away? Well first, they want to strip the Commission of its ability to order restitution for victims of bad brokers. Really? Yeah, they argue the agency isn't capable of determining appropriate financial damages.

But far more concerning is the attempt to remove the Commission's authority to investigate brokers who mishandle the funds of others. What does that mean exactly? The lobbyists argue that if a broker is holding money outside of a strict traditional real estate transaction, the DRE has no business auditing those accounts. So what does this all mean? If these Sunset Bill amendments pass, does that mean the Commission essentially becomes a toothless watchdog? Basically.

Like a security guard who can watch a bank robbery happening on the security monitors but isn't legally allowed to pick up the phone and call the police? That is exactly what it means. To understand the real-world stakes of removing that audit authority, just look at the case of Brett Lampier. The broker who was acting as a builder, right? Yes.

Lampier was acting as a developer for a condominium project in northern Colorado. Okay. He was taking massive cash deposits from consumers who believed they were securing a future home.

Right. Because the DRE had the statutory authority to audit trust accounts and track the funds of others, their investigator was able to pull the thread without needing a police warrant. That's a huge power.

It is. They opened his books and discovered Lampier had defrauded consumers out of 1.6 million dollars. 7.6 million dollars in deposit money.

Just gone. Just gone. And he wasn't using that money to build condos.

What was he doing with it? He was using consumer deposits to take personal vacations to set up a separate business for his wife. Oh my gosh. And he literally handed $300,000 to a business partner so the partner could go buy a personal house.

It's sickening. Because the DRE had the power to audit those funds, they built a comprehensive case that they handed over to the Weld County DA and the FBI. And what happened? That resulted in a felony conviction for securities fraud.

Good. But if the lobbyists succeed in shipping the rule that allows the DRE to audit the funds of others, massive fraud cases like Lampier's might never be uncovered. The state would lose its early detection system.

And it gets worse, right? Because the lobbyists are also trying to fundamentally alter the concept of consent on the forms themselves. Correct. They are proposing changing the legal standard on contracts from informed consent to express consent.

Which, just based on the English language, sounds stronger. Express sounds like I am absolutely agreeing to something. It sounds stronger, but as the division director who used to be a police officer explained in the meetings, express consent is actually vastly weaker when it comes to consumer protection.

How so? She used a brilliant analogy regarding DUIs. When you drive a car in Colorado, by simply operating the vehicle on a public road, you automatically give your express consent to a blood or breath test if pulled over. Right.

You don't sign a consent form before you turn the ignition. Exactly. You don't read a disclosure about your rights.

You don't get warned about how your data will be used. You just drive. You just give blanket consent simply by participating in the activity of driving.

Wow. If real estate contracts revert to express consent, it destroys the protections of informed consent. Consumers would essentially be signing blanket waivers regarding their confidential information without ever being educated on the risks.

So all the agonizing we just talked about, the bold font for scriveners, the terrifying HOA warnings, the specific examples of conflicts of interest. All of it. All of that goes out the window if the state agency enforcing it is legally blindfolded by the legislature.

It reverts the industry back to the dark ages of consumer protection. Whether you are buying a house, renting an apartment, or you are just fascinated by how the rules of the game are made, these 2027 forms represent the invisible guardrails of the biggest financial decisions of your life. They really do.

If you don't understand the mechanisms behind the paperwork, you don't understand your own vulnerabilities. And this raises an important question, one that really stuck with me from the legislative testimony. What's that? If you are the listener, you're probably thinking about the Brett Lampere fraud case and saying, well if my broker steals my money, I'll just sue their insurance.

Right, that's what everyone assumes. During the Sunset Bill hearings, lawmakers assumed the exact same thing. Lobbyists told them not to worry about stripping the DRE's power to audit fraud because brokers carry errors and omissions insurance E&O.

The argument was, if a broker steals your money, the insurance will cover the victim. But the DRE went on record to state that this is completely false. Wait, errors and omissions insurance doesn't cover theft? No.

E&O insurance policies explicitly exclude intentional criminal acts. You're kidding. I'm not.

It does not cover fraud. It does not cover theft. So when you hire a professional, you naturally assume their insurance protects you if they run off with your life savings.

Right. But if their policy explicitly excludes fraud and lawmakers successfully stripped the Division of Real Estate's power to audit those stolen funds, who is actually going to get your money back?

***Colorado Broker Podcast by Apex***