

DISTRICT COURT, BOULDER COUNTY, COLORADO

Case No. 2022DR30458 Divisions Involved: **13 (Administrative)**, 14, M, and 5 Filed in Division 13 - Administrative Clarification Request

PETITIONER'S ONE-PAGE REQUEST FOR ADMINISTRATIVE CLARIFICATION REGARDING C.R.C.P. 60(b) FINAL PARAGRAPH

Petitioner Charles R. Bell respectfully submits this request for administrative clarification. Divisions 5 and 14 have applied inconsistent interpretations of the final paragraph of C.R.C.P. 60(b), and neither division has identified whether the 182-day standard applies to filings made under that paragraph. Clarification is necessary so Petitioner may comply with the Court's procedural requirements under his ADA accommodations.

The January 31, 2023 Joint Expert Order was issued by Judge Thomas Mulvahill. The 2023 permanent orders trial was later presided over by Judge Salomone, now Chief Judge. A recent ruling from Division 2 noted that matters arising from this case must be addressed within the domestic relations proceeding. In that ruling, Division 2 applied Rule 60(b)'s final paragraph without reference to a 182-day limitation, while Divisions 5 and 14 have treated Rule 60(b) filings as time-barred under that standard. These differing approaches leave Petitioner unable to determine which interpretation governs filings made under the final paragraph. Newly reviewed record materials, including the June 16, 2023 disclosure, together with these internal inconsistencies, make administrative clarification essential at this time.

1. Need for Clarification - Division 14's November 13, 2025 order referenced Petitioner's reliance on *In re Marriage of Gance*, 36 P.3d 114 (Colo. App. 2001), but did not address the final paragraph of Rule 60(b). Division 5's October 2, 2025 order did not analyze the paragraph at all. These differing treatments leave Petitioner unable to determine whether the 182-day standard applies to filings under the final paragraph.

2. Petitioner's Understanding - Petitioner understands that the 182-day limit applies only to subsections (b)(1)–(3). Petitioner further understands, based on *Gance*, that filings under the final paragraph of Rule 60(b) are not subject to a fixed time limit. Petitioner seeks clarification so he may follow the correct procedural standard.

3. ADA Basis - Petitioner's ability to comply with Court procedures depends on receiving clear guidance regarding the applicable timing rule. Earlier clarification would have reduced repeated filings and will ensure consistent compliance across Divisions 14, M, and 5. The lack of uniform guidance has already required Petitioner to file a notice of appeal to preserve his rights, and without clarification, additional appeals may become necessary. Clarification at this stage would reduce unnecessary appellate proceedings and allow Petitioner to comply with district-wide procedural expectation.

Petitioner respectfully requests administrative clarification regarding the timeliness standard governing filings under the final paragraph of C.R.C.P. 60(b).

s/ Charles R. Bell Date: November 17, 2025 Pro Se (ADA Accommodations on File)