

DISTRICT COURT, BOULDER COUNTY, COLORADO		<p>DATE FILED January 12, 2026 2:52 PM CASE NUMBER: 2022DR30458</p> <p>△ COURT USE ONLY △</p> <p>Case Number: 2022DR30458 Division: 14 Courtroom:</p>
Court Address: 1777 SIXTH STREET P.O. BOX 4249, BOULDER, CO, 80306-4249		
Petitioner(s) CHARLES BELL and Co-Petitioner(s) ALYSON BELL		
Order re: Request for Leave to File Motion - Denied		

The motion/proposed order attached hereto: DENIED.

This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner's Request for Leave to File a Motion regarding his continued attempts to demonstrate there was fraud which would allow him relief pursuant to C.R.C.P. 60(b). Here, Petitioner is seeking to file a new Rule 60(b) Motion based upon the January 31, 2023 Joint Expert Stipulation, the Domestic Relations Case Management Order, the June 16, 2023 Witness Disclosure and a second disclosure filed on July 17, 2023.

Petitioner claims to have "newly discovered admissible evidence" in support of his claims.

Petitioner has previously filed multiple motions regarding the Rule 60(b) issue. Originally, his motions were filed while the original permanent order were under appeal. The Court took no action as it did not have jurisdiction to do so. On October 2, 2025, the Court DENIED Petitioner's Motion.

On October 10, 2025, Petitioner filed a notice of appeal regarding the Court's denial of Petitioner's Motion for Relief. That appeal is currently pending.

The Court DENIES Petitioner's request for leave to file a Motion regarding additional 60(b) allegations on two grounds. First, the issue regarding fraud pursuant to C.R.C.P. 60(b) is currently under review by the Court of Appeals. As such, the Court does not have jurisdiction to address the Rule 60(b) issue.

More importantly however, the Court issued a revised order restricting Petitioner's ability to file motions with the Court. The Court had granted Petitioner's request to file a motion as it did not, on its face, allege any fraud. Unfortunately, the motion that was filed addressed renewed allegations of fraud. On November 13, 2025, the Court further RESTRICTED Petitioner's ability to file pro se filings alleging fraud pursuant to C.R.C.P. 60(b) by requiring Petitioner to file such a motion with an attorney who would verify its appropriateness pursuant to C.R.C.P. 11.

The Court therefore DENIES the Petitioner's request because Petitioner has failed to retain counsel to address any future C.R.C.P. 60 motions. This filing cannot be made without Petitioner going through counsel first.

Issue Date: 1/12/2026



TIMOTHY LEE JOHNSON
District Court Judge

DISTRICT COURT, BOULDER COUNTY, COLORADO20th Judicial District | **Division 13** | Case No. 2022DR30458

Petitioner Charles R. Bell, pro se, respectfully requests leave to file a narrowly confined motion under C.R.C.P. 60(b), final paragraph (the “savings clause”) seeking relief for fraud upon the court. This request is not brought as ordinary party-to-party fraud. It invokes the Court’s preserved authority to protect the integrity of its own proceedings.

1. Relief requested (leave only) - Leave to file one motion titled: *“Motion for Relief Under C.R.C.P. 60(b), Final Paragraph”*, with exhibits.

2. Why Division 13 is the proper forum. Petitioner seeks to present this savings-clause proffer to the tribunal that entered the judgment at issue and whose decisional reliability is implicated. Petitioner is not seeking appellate review of another division’s rulings. *This request is consistent with Division 2’s directive recognizing that a Rule 60(b) motion alleging deception of the tribunal must be presented to the tribunal whose judgment is challenged*, and that one district court may not superintend or review another. (See *In re Marriage of Seely*; *State ex rel. Dep’t of Corrs. v. Pena*).

3. Procedural posture and acknowledgment - Petitioner acknowledges that Division 14 has stated it will not accept further filings alleging fraud or seeking Rule 60 relief unless filed by counsel, based on a prior mismatch between a leave description and a later filing. Petitioner is not asking this Court to review or modify that ruling. Petitioner submits this document as a one-page request for leave only, supported by a limited proffer, and will file no *C.R.C.P. 60(b) final-paragraph* motion unless leave is granted and the motion conforms to the scope described here.

4. Limited proffer and record anchors (self-authenticating filings) - If leave is granted, the proposed motion will be limited to authenticated court filings and narrowly defined issues, including:

- **January 31, 2023 Joint Expert Stipulation** / Order (Filing ID: D9F074CCD0FFD).
- Domestic Relations Case Management Order (Filed December 9, 2022, 8:05 AM).
- **June 16, 2023** Witness Disclosure (Filing ID: 12E14E22975AD), reflecting the disputed expert-designation posture.
- **Second disclosure** relied upon in the expert-designation posture (Filed July 17, 2023; Filing ID: 5E574FCC1A11C).

Petitioner’s proffer is that these materials, together with newly discovered admissible evidence to be presented if leave is granted, show the tribunal was misled regarding expert designation and related reliance, and that this Rule 60(b) final-paragraph proffer has never been presented for, or received, a merits adjudication.

5. Requested order Petitioner respectfully requests an order: (1) granting leave to file the proposed C.R.C.P. 60(b) final-paragraph motion in Division 13; and (2) setting a limited briefing schedule or brief status/telephone conference for threshold review.