Colorado Supreme Court 2 East 14th Avenue Denver, CO 80203	DATE FILED November 4, 2026 CASE NUMBER: 2026SA383
Original Proceeding in Unauthorized Practice of Law 25UPL107 & 26UPL6	
Petitioner: The People of the State of Colorado, **v.** **Respondent:** Mariana Orduna.	Supreme Court Case No: 2026SA383
ORDER OF COURT	

The Court, having reviewed the parties' Stipulation and Agreement, enjoins Respondent from further engaging in the unauthorized practice of law and orders her to pay the costs of the proceeding said costs to be paid to the office of attorney regulation counsel within (14) days from the date of this order.

BY THE COURT, NOVEMBER 4, 2026.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO 2 E. 14th Ave. Denver, Colorado 80203 ORIGINAL PROCEEDING IN UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW	DATE FILED November 3, 2026 1:21 PM FILING ID: 2611C58EF1379 CASE NUMBER: 2026SA383
Petitioner: THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO Respondent: MARIANA ORDUNA	▲COURT USE ONLY▲
Samuel O'Shea Kesten, #57720 Assistant Regulation Counsel Attorneys for Petitioner 1300 Broadway, Suite 500 Denver, Colorado 80203 Telephone: (303) 928-7907 Email: s.kesten@csc.state.co.us Mariana Orduna, Respondent, *pro se* 8155 E. Fairmount Dr, Unit 1126 Denver, CO 80230 Telephone: 702-885-0373	Case Number:

STIPULATION, AGREEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT CONSENTING TO AN ORDER OF INJUNCTION

On this 3rd day of November, 2026, Samuel O'Shea Kesten, Assistant Regulation Counsel and attorney for Petitioner, and Mariana Orduna, the Respondent, *pro se*, in these proceedings, hereby file this *Stipulation, Agreement and Affidavit Consenting to an Order of Injunction* ("Stipulation"), and submit the same to the Colorado Supreme Court for a finding and order of injunction under C.R.C.P. 232.17, *et seq*., and in support, state as follows:

1. Respondent is subject to the jurisdiction of this Court in these proceedings per C.R.C.P. 232.2, as she is a nonlawyer who has been alleged to have engaged in or attempted to engage in the practice of law in Colorado, as described in more detail herein.

2. Respondent resides in Colorado and does business in Colorado.

3. Respondent understands the Colorado Supreme Court has exclusive jurisdiction to determine what constitutes the practice of law in Colorado.

4. Respondent is familiar with the rules of the Colorado Supreme Court regarding the unauthorized practice of law. Respondent acknowledges the right to a full and complete evidentiary hearing on the charges in a petition for injunction. At any such hearing, Respondent would have the right to represented by counsel, present evidence, call witnesses, and cross-examine witnesses presented by Petitioner. At any such formal hearing, Petitioner would have the burden of proof and would be required to prove the charges contained in a petition for injunction by a preponderance of the evidence. Nonetheless, having full knowledge of the right to such a formal hearing, Respondent waives that right.

5. Respondent enters this stipulation freely and voluntarily. It is Respondent's decision to enter into this stipulation, and Respondent affirms that this agreement is not the product of coercion, duress, or other intimidating acts by any person or agency. Respondent is fully aware of the implications of the admissions made herein.

6. Respondent understands that prohibited activities by a nonlawyer include the lay exercise of legal discretion, such as advice to clients regarding legal matters. *People v. Adams*, 243 P.3d 256, 266 (Colo. 2010). In addition, Respondent understands that preparation of legal documents for others by an unlicensed person, other than solely as a typist or scrivener, which includes acting as a form preparer as permitted by federal law, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 2, is the unauthorized practice of law, unless the Colorado Supreme Court has authorized such action in a specific circumstances. *Title Guaranty Co. v. Denver Bar Ass'n*, 312 P.2d 1011, 1012 (Colo. 1957). Further "[A]n unlicensed person engages in the unauthorized practice of law by offering legal advice about a specific case, drafting or selecting legal pleadings for another's use in a judicial proceeding without the supervision of an attorney, or holding oneself out as the representative of another in a legal action." *People v. Shell*, 148 P.3d 162, 171 (Colo. 2006); *see also Comm. v. Grimes*, 654 P.2d 822, 823 (Colo. 1982) [offering case-specific legal advice and selecting case-specific legal documents constitutes the practice of law].

7. Respondent understands that under C.R.C.P. 232.2(b), the "practice of law" includes the following:

(1) Protecting, defending, or enforcing the legal rights or duties of another person;

(2) Representing another person before any tribunal or, on behalf of another person, drafting pleadings or other papers for any proceeding before any tribunal;

(3) Counseling, advising, or assisting another person in connection with that person's legal rights or duties;

(4) Exercising legal judgment in preparing legal documents for another person; and

(5) Any other activity the supreme court determines to constitute the practice of law.

8. Respondent understands that under C.R.C.P. 232.2(c), prohibited activities by a nonlawyer include:

(1) Exercising legal judgment to advise another person about the legal effect of a proposed action or decision;

(2) Exercising legal judgment to advise another person about legal remedies or possible courses of legal action available to that person;

(3) Exercising legal judgment to select a legal document for another person or to prepare a legal document for another person, other than solely as a typist or scrivener;

(4) Exercising legal judgment to represent or advocate for another person in a negotiation, settlement conference, mediation, or alternative dispute resolution proceeding;

(5) Exercising legal judgment to represent or advocate for another person in a hearing, trial, or other legal proceeding before a tribunal;

(6) Advertising or holding oneself out, either directly or impliedly, as an attorney, a lawyer, "Esquire," a legal consultant, or a legal advocate, or in any other manner that conveys capability or authorization to provide unsupervised services involving the exercise of legal judgment;

(7) Owning or controlling a for-profit entity that is not authorized under C.R.C.P. 265 and that provides services involving the exercise of legal judgment;

(8) Soliciting any fees for services involving the exercise of legal judgment;

(9) Owning or controlling a website, application, software, bot, or other technology that interactively offers or provides services involving the exercise of legal judgment; and

(10) Performing any other activity that constitutes the practice of law as set for in subsection (b) above.

9. Respondent understands these prohibitions exist in Colorado and that she has engaged in activities by holding herself out in ways that state or imply that she is authorized or otherwise capable to perform legal services that constitutes the unauthorized practice of law. The parties stipulate to the following conclusions:

Background

10. Respondent is not licensed to practice law in the state of Colorado, or any federal or state jurisdiction in the United States.

11. Respondent was not and is not an accredited representative[1] authorized to check the AR box on federal immigration forms.

12. Respondent owns and operates AMC Expert Services ("AMC"). She and her mother founded the company on or around January 19, 2024.

13. AMC advertised its services on Facebook and Instagram as lawyers and paralegals of immigration. AMC listed its category of services as legal.

Immigration Services & Advertisements

14. Respondent was hired by a client, A.A., to assist A.A. with a problem relating to a *Petition for Alien Relative* and to initiate J.A.'s *Petition for Alien Relative* application. J.A. and A.A. are married.

15. A.A. paid respondent a total of $2,365, which was to include the filing fees and labor for both A.A. and J.A.

16. Respondent prepared and filed an I-824 on behalf of A.A., which did not correct the problem with A.A.'s pending I-130 application.

17. Respondent neither prepared nor filed anything on behalf of J.A.

18. Respondent has refunded the entirety of the $2,365 to A.A.

19. Respondent was hired by a client, D.S., to assist her with applying for permanent or legal status for her husband, Y.O. D.S. became a citizen not long before hiring Respondent.

20. D.S. paid Respondent a total of $4,375, which was to include the filing fees to USCIS and labor for Y.O.'s application.

21. Respondent prepared *Adjustment of Status* application for Y.O. and filed both an I-130 and I-485 with USCIS. USCIS only had partial jurisdiction over these two applications, which caused issues for Y.O and D.S.

22. Y.O.'s application was closed by USCIS, which allowed him to pursue a new remedy through an attorney hired subsequently, at personal cost.

23. Respondent has refunded the entirety of the $4,375 to D.S.

24. Respondent understands that as a non-lawyer and a non-accredited representative, she is only permitted to assist clients with general form preparation, translation, administrative support, and any other activity that does not constitute the authorized practice of law.

---

[1] Accredited representatives are non-attorneys permitted to represent undocumented persons before the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR). Accredited representatives must work for non-profits and must complete training to receive accreditation by the EOIR.

25. Respondent acknowledges that in her accepting payment from A.A. and D.S. to perform immigration related legal work for A.A, J.A. and Y.O, she was engaged in the unauthorized practice of law.

26. Respondent advertised her company, AMC, on various social media platforms including Facebook and Instagram. Respondent allowed or permitted AMC's Facebook page to state the category of AMC's work as "Legal Service." Respondent allowed or permitted AMC's Instagram title page to state, "Abogados & Paralegales de Inmagracion | AMC Expert Services" (translates to Lawyers & Paralegals of Immigration | AMC Expert Services).

27. Respondent recognizes her responsibility for the content contained on these social media pages.

28. Respondent removed the website for AMC, the AMC Facebook page, and the AMC Instagram page on or around April of 2025.

29. Through the aforementioned conduct in advertising her services through AMC, Respondent engaged in the authorized practice of law.

Agreement to Injunction and Other Relief

30. As part of this agreement, the People and Respondent agree to the following: 1) Respondent is enjoined from any future unauthorized practice of law and/or engaging in activities that constitute the practice of law in Colorado, including those identified within C.R.C.P. 232.2 and in this agreement; 2) and Respondent will pay the administrative costs of these proceedings in the amount of $224.00, made payable to the Colorado Supreme Court Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel. *See* Ex. 1, Statement of Costs.

31. The Parties further agree that Respondent has made all necessary restitution payments: $2,365 to A.A. and $4,375 to D.S.'s family. Respondent shall not be subject to an additional restitution order.

32. This Stipulation is premised and conditioned upon acceptance of the same by the Court. If, for any reason, the Stipulation is not accepted without changes or modification, then the admissions, confessions, and stipulations made by Respondent will be of no effect. Either party will have the opportunity to accept or reject any modification. If either party rejects the modification, then the parties shall be entitled to a full evidentiary hearing; and no confession, stipulation, or statement made by Respondent in conjunction with this offer may be used by either party.

33. By stipulating to this injunction, Respondent is exempt from a fine pursuant to C.R.C.P. 232.17(c).

RECOMMENDATION FOR AND CONSENT TO INJUNCTION AND ORDER FOR COSTS

Based on the foregoing, the parties hereto ask this Court to enjoin Respondent from further engagement in the unauthorized practice of law, and to order Respondent to pay the costs of the proceedings within 14 days of the issuance of the injunction.

Respondent, *pro* se, and Samuel Kesten, attorney for Petitioner, acknowledge that by signing this document, they have read and reviewed the above and request the Colorado Supreme Court accept the terms of this Stipulation as set forth above.

Respectfully submitted this 13 of November, 2026.

Samuel O'Shea Kesten, #57720
Assistant Regulation Counsel
1300 Broadway, Suite 500
Denver, CO 80203

Attorney for the Complainant

Mariana Orduna
8155 E. Fairmount Dr, Unit 1126
Denver, CO 80230

Respondent

[Signature Page Follows]

STATE OF COLORADO)
)ss:
COUNTY OF Denver)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3rd day of November, 2026, by Mariana Orduna, the Respondent.

Witness my hand and official seal.

My commission expires: March 11, 2030

LESLY MEDRANO
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF COLORADO
NOTARY ID 20264009711
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 11, 2030

Notary Public

Statement of Costs

Mariana Orduna
25UPL107, 26UPL6

11/3/2026	**Administrative Fee**	**$**	**224.00**
	AMOUNT DUE	**$**	**224.00**

EXHIBIT 1