

<p style="text-align: center;">SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO ORIGINAL PROCEEDING IN THE UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE 1300 BROADWAY, SUITE 250 DENVER, CO 80203</p>	
<p>Petitioner: THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO</p> <p>Respondents: JUSTYCE GORDON, a/k/a ANN MARIE GORDON, a/k/a AMANDA GORDON</p>	<p>Case Number: 25SA73</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">ORDER ENTERING DEFAULT JUDGMENT UNDER C.R.C.P. 55(b) AND REPORT OF HEARING MASTER UNDER C.R.C.P. 232.16(b)(3) and C.R.C.P. 232.20</p>	

Before the Presiding Disciplinary Judge ("the PDJ") is "Petitioner's Motion for Default Judgment Pursuant to C.R.C.P. 55(b); 121 §1-14; and 232.16(b)(3)," filed by Michele L. Melnick, Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel ("the People"), on July 2, 2025. Justyce Gordon, a/k/a Ann Marie Gordon, a/k/a Amanda Gordon ("Respondent") did not respond. The PDJ now enters default judgment against Respondent and recommends that the Colorado Supreme Court enjoin her from the unauthorized practice of law and order her to pay fines and costs.

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The People filed a "Petition for Injunction Per C.R.C.P. 232.15(a)" on March 11, 2025, alleging Respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law. The next day, the Colorado Supreme Court issued an "Order to Show Cause," directing Respondent to answer in writing and show cause within twenty-one days of service why she should not be enjoined from the unauthorized practice of law. The People served the petition and order by personal service on March 14, 2025, but Respondent did not respond to the petition or the show cause order.

On April 18, 2025, the Colorado Supreme Court issued an "Order of Court," referring this matter to the PDJ as a hearing master to prepare a report setting forth "findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations." On April 21, 2025, the PDJ ordered Respondent to answer the People's petition no later than May 5, 2025. The PDJ warned Respondent that if she failed to answer, the PDJ would deem admitted the allegations and charges in the People's petition. But Respondent did not respond. The People then moved for entry of default under C.R.C.P. 232.16(b)(2), and the PDJ directed Respondent to respond to the default motion.

Respondent did not do so. As a result, the PDJ entered default against Respondent, deeming admitted the allegations contained in the petition for injunction, including the allegation that Respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law.

On July 2, 2025, the People filed their motion for default judgment. The following day, the PDJ issued an order directing Respondent to respond by July 17, 2025. Respondent did not respond. Nor did she appear at a prehearing conference the PDJ held that same day.

II. PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT

The People followed the procedure for default judgments set forth in C.R.C.P. 55 and C.R.C.P. 121 section 1-14 by showing valid service on Respondent; submitting an affidavit indicating that venue is proper and that Respondent is not a minor, an incapacitated person, an officer of the state, or in the military; and filing a statement of the costs.¹ Accordingly, the PDJ **GRANTS** the People's motion and enters default judgment under C.R.C.P. 232.16(b)(3).

III. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The PDJ issues the following report to the Colorado Supreme Court under C.R.C.P. 232.20. The factual findings are taken from the petition's allegations, which were deemed admitted on entry of default.

Factual Findings

Respondent is a Colorado resident; her last registered business address is 2311 North Grand Avenue, Pueblo, Colorado 81003. She has used aliases "Ann Marie Gordon" and "Amanda Gordon." Respondent is not licensed as a lawyer to practice law in Colorado or any other state. Nor is she licensed by the Colorado Supreme Court through Colorado's Licensed Legal Paraprofessional ("LLP") program under C.R.C.P. 207 *et seq.* Respondent is subject to the jurisdiction of this Court under C.R.C.P. 232.2(a).

Respondent provided legal services to Mr. Valdez² in Pueblo County District Court case number 20DR352 when she sent communications on his behalf to opposing counsel, prepared a draft stipulation to address parenting time between the parties, and signed the finalized stipulation.

¹ See Mot. Exs. 1-2.

² The client is only identified as "Mr. Valdez" in the People's petition.

Ms. Frashuer³ and Valdez have children together. Frashuer retained counsel to file a motion to restrict Valdez's parenting time. Valdez initially proceeded pro se.

On February 6 and 7, 2023, Respondent left a message and then spoke with Magistrate Radakovich's clerk, Clerk Valez. Respondent misrepresented herself as an LLP with the new paraprofessional program in Colorado, and she gave Clerk Valez a four-digit license number. Respondent told Clerk Valez that she was a legal advocate helping Valdez with his case and that she planned to file a motion to continue the matter.

On October 16, 2023, Respondent sent opposing counsel Brett Chalmers an email:

Good Evening Brett,

It was a pleasure speaking with you today. As discussed, we have prepared the attached proposed stipulation of the Parties in hopes of resolving the issues and concerns as laid out in Ms. Frashuer's Motion to Restrict Parenting Time filed with the Court on October 6, 2023. [Valdez] and his Family LOVES their Children and would love nothing else but to be able to work together with [Frashuer] to ensure that they have everything that they want and/or need. It is his hope that this can continue to prove that their Children are ALWAYS safe in his and/or his Family's care. Please review the attached, and let us know your thoughts on any requested modifications. I also researched Soberlink and they state that the following form must be filled out, signed by the Judge, and provided to them when [Mr. Valdez] meets them on Friday to purchase and set up the new device and system as a whole. He has already downloaded the Talking Parents application so that he will be ready to begin utilizing once this is approved by our Judge.

Again, thank you very much for all of your time today, and we look forward to hearing from you soon. Once we have a signed agreement, we can e-file it, and I will also hand deliver a copy to the Clerk as early as possible in hopes of vacating the hearing and saving the Parties any additional attorney's fees and/or court costs.

Respectfully,
Justyce A. Gordon, LLP/MBLA⁴

Chalmers also received texts and a phone call from Respondent about the litigation. Respondent informed Chalmers she was working with Valdez to try to resolve the parenting situation with Frashuer. Chalmers did not believe Respondent was a lawyer but presumed she was providing legal advice to Valdez, whom he understood earned a modest income.

³ The opposing party is only identified as "Ms. Frashuer" in the People's petition.

⁴ Pet. ¶ 15.

Respondent and Valdez provided a draft stipulation to Chalmers. Chalmers made several changes to the draft stipulation. Because Respondent was assisting Valdez with the stipulation, Chalmers kept Respondent's signature block on the stipulation.

On October 17, 2023, Chalmers filed a "Stipulation Re: Petitioner's Motion to Restrict Parenting Time Pursuant to C.R.S. § 14-10-129(4)" in the case. Chalmers signed the stipulation as lawyer for Frashuer; Respondent signed as "Justyce A.M. Gordon, LLP" as "Legal Advocate" for Valdez. Chalmers attached a transaction report to the filing reflecting the date and time that each recipient received the stipulation. Respondent received the stipulation on October 17, 2023, via email at onlythebest4u@qualityservice.com. She e-signed the stipulation from that email address the same day. Chalmers did not hear from Respondent again. On October 17, 2023, Magistrate Radakovich granted the stipulation. Respondent never appeared in court while she was assisting Valdez.

Around October 17, 2023, someone using Valdez's information signed up for e-filing with the court system ("CoCourts"). The CoCourts enrollment contained Respondent's phone number and her email address but used Valdez's name, rather than Respondent's, as the owner of the account.

Shortly thereafter, Valdez was incarcerated for allegedly violating a protection order. Respondent electronically filed a motion to continue the domestic relations case using Valdez's name via CoCourts. The motion stated:

On February 6, 2024, it was brought to [Valdez's] attention that the Petitioner had filed a report with the Pueblo Police Department outlining an alleged violation of restraining order that allegedly took place over two months ago. [Valdez] made the appropriate plans and respectfully turned himself immediately and as such will not be prepared or available to participate in the hearing scheduled to occur on February 7, 2024 at 1:15 p.m. in Division 402. [Valdez] also has several other conflicting hearings now scheduled on February 7, 2024, to occur throughout the day in Division 306 and Division 404. Mainly due to the above, [Valdez] respectfully requests to continue the hearing in Division 402 at 1:15 p.m. so that he can be sufficiently present and physically present.⁵

Although alcohol monitoring was a required element of the stipulation, Valdez did not comply with the required Soberlink testing and payments after Magistrate Radakovich granted the stipulation.

On March 7, 2024, Magistrate Radakovich held a restriction hearing. Valdez and Frashuer both appeared pro se that afternoon. The next day, Respondent efiled a motion for reinstatement of parenting time using Valdez's name in CoCourts. Magistrate Radakovich denied Respondent's

⁵ Pet. ¶ 34.

request. On April 25, 2024, Magistrate Radakovich reinstated the restrictions on Valdez's parenting time.

Respondent communicated with Chalmers via a phone number linked to the company Colorado LegalEase, LLC. The address associated with Colorado LegalEase, LLC, is in Pueblo, Colorado. At the time Respondent and Chalmers communicated, Colorado LegalEase, LLC, had a website, www.coloradolegalease.com, which is no longer active. That website informed prospective clients:

What areas do you provide Document Preparation in?

Colorado LegalEase, LLC helps to provide general document preparation in areas such as: Simple Dissolution of Marriage, Allocation of Parental Responsibilities, Child Support, Adoptions, Name Changes, etc. We CANNOT provide legal advice, nor can we represent you in any Court until such time that we have successfully passed the Colorado Bar Exam. For additional information regarding Colorado's new LLP Program, please click on the following link: <https://coloradosupremecourt.com/Future%20Lawyers/LLPExamination.asp>⁶

The consultation section of the Colorado LegalEase, LLC, website stated: "Case/Assignment Review: Gain a fresh perspective on legal matters! Our dedicated lawyers meticulously examine your papers, providing insightful analysis and encouragement for a successful outcome."⁷ But Colorado LegalEase, LLC, did not actually employ lawyers.

Conclusions of Law

The Colorado Supreme Court, which "exercises exclusive jurisdiction over all matters in Colorado involving the unauthorized practice of law,"⁸ restricts the practice of law to protect members of the public from receiving incompetent legal advice from unqualified individuals.⁹ Unless authorized by Colorado Supreme Court case law, federal law, tribal law, or other valid law, a nonlawyer may not engage in the practice of law in Colorado.¹⁰ The practice of law in Colorado includes protecting, defending, or enforcing the legal rights or duties of another person; drafting pleadings or other papers for any proceeding before any tribunal on behalf of another person;

⁶ Pet. ¶ 43.

⁷ Pet. ¶ 44.

⁸ C.R.C.P. 232.3.

⁹ *Unauthorized Practice of Law Comm. v. Grimes*, 654 P.2d 822, 826 (Colo. 1982); *see also Charter One Mortg. Corp. v. Condra*, 865 N.E.2d 602, 605 (Ind. 2007) ("Confining the practice of law to licensed attorneys is designed to protect the public from the potentially severe consequences of following advice on legal matters from unqualified persons."); *In re Baker*, 85 A.2d 505, 514 (N.J. 1952) ("The amateur at law is as dangerous to the community as an amateur surgeon would be.").

¹⁰ C.R.C.P. 232.2(b).

counseling, advising or assisting another person in connection with that person's legal rights or duties; exercising legal judgment in preparing legal documents for another person; and any other activity the Colorado Supreme Court determines to constitute the practice of law.¹¹ The Colorado Supreme Court licenses some nonlawyers to practice law in a limited capacity as an LLP.¹²

As relevant to this case, a nonlawyer who is not otherwise authorized to act as an LLP engages in the unauthorized practice of law by exercising legal judgment in advising another person about legal remedies or possible courses of legal action available to that person; by exercising legal judgment to prepare a legal document for another person, other than solely as a typist or scrivener; by advertising or holding themselves out, either directly or impliedly, as legal consultants or legal advocates, or in any other manner that conveys capability or authorization to provide unsupervised services involving the exercise of legal judgment; or by soliciting any fees for services involving the exercise of legal judgment.¹³

Based on the facts established on default, the PDJ finds that Respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law. Those facts demonstrate that Respondent is not licensed to practice law in Colorado or any other jurisdiction. Nor is she licensed by the Colorado Supreme Court as an LLP. Yet Respondent held herself out as a representative in protecting, enforcing, and defending Valdez's legal rights in his domestic relations case. She provided legal services to Valdez when she sent communications on his behalf to opposing counsel in that matter, prepared a draft stipulation to address parenting time between the parties, signed the finalized stipulation, and prepared and filed other motions for him. And she used Valdez's electronic filing account to submit filings on his behalf and to receive court communications regarding his case. More egregiously, however, Respondent pursued this course of action by misrepresenting her status, fraudulently holding herself out to Clerk Valez as an LLP; providing a fake LLP license number to substantiate that misrepresentation; and improperly using LLP credentials when she signed the stipulation on Valdez's behalf and when she filed the motion to continue.¹⁴

¹¹ C.R.C.P. 232.2(b)(1)-(5); *see also People v. Shell*, 148 P.3d 162, 171 (Colo. 2006) (holding that one who acts "in a representative capacity in protecting, enforcing, or defending the legal rights and duties of another and in counseling, advising and assisting that person in connection with these rights and duties" engages in the practice of law) (Colo. 2006) (citing *Denver Bar Ass'n v. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 391 P.2d 467, 471 (Colo. 1964)).

¹² C.R.C.P. 207.1(a).

¹³ C.R.C.P. 232.2(c); *see also Shell*, 148 P.3d at 171 ("[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."); *Binkley v. People*, 716 P.2d 1111, 1114 (Colo. 1986) ("Anyone advertising as a lawyer holds himself or herself out as an attorney, attorney-at-law, or counsel-at-law and, if not properly licensed, may be held in contempt of court for practicing law without a license.").

¹⁴ The PDJ cannot find by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent's affiliation with Colorado LegalEase, LLC, as described in the established facts, suffices to show that she owned or controlled that company such that her conduct ran afoul of C.R.C.P. 232.2(c)(7) (prohibiting

IV. INJUNCTION, FINE, AND COSTS

In their motion, the People ask the PDJ to recommend that the Colorado Supreme Court enjoin Respondent from the unauthorized practice of law; fine Respondent \$1,000.00 for engaging in the unauthorized practice of law described in the petition; and assess \$374.00 in costs against Respondent.¹⁵

As relevant here, C.R.C.P. 232.14 provides that a respondent found to have engaged in the unauthorized practice of law may be enjoined from the practice of law, assessed costs of the proceeding, and fined from \$250.00 to \$1,500.00 for each incident of the unauthorized practice of law. In assessing fines, the Colorado Supreme Court previously has examined whether a respondent's actions were "malicious or pursued in bad faith" and whether the respondent engaged in unlawful activities over an extended timeframe despite warnings.¹⁶

Based on the PDJ's legal conclusions that Respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law, the PDJ recommends that the Colorado Supreme Court enjoin Respondent from the unauthorized practice of law to protect Colorado's residents.

The PDJ also recommends that the Colorado Supreme Court fine Respondent \$1,500.00, rather than the more modest \$1,000.00 fine the People seek. The PDJ finds that the more substantial fine is appropriate because Respondent dishonestly held herself out as licensed to practice law in Colorado as an LLP. Respondent profited from her unauthorized practice of law, which put Valdez at legal risk. Even more egregious, however, she did so by intentionally misrepresenting her status, impersonating an LLP, which the PDJ finds to threaten and undermine the nascent LLP program. Respondent's conduct is similar to cases involving a layperson inappropriately impersonating a lawyer.¹⁷ As such, Respondent's conduct risked substantial public harm and should be met with a significant monetary penalty to disincentive further such behavior.

owning or controlling an unauthorized for-profit entity that provides legal services involving the exercise of legal judgment).

¹⁵ See Mot. Ex. 1. The People request that these costs be assessed jointly and severally; the Court cannot make such a recommendation, as only one individual or entity is named as respondent in this matter.

¹⁶ *People v. Adams*, 243 P.3d 256, 267-68 (Colo. 2010).

¹⁷ See e.g., *People ex rel Atty. Gen. v. Castleman*, 294 P. 535, 535 (Colo. 1930) ("The evidence against respondent is of record and before us. It consists of the fact that his name does not appear on the roll of attorneys in the office of the clerk of this court, and the certificate of the clerk of the district court of the city and county of Denver that he appeared therein as counsel for the defendant in case No. 30522, pending in that court, and as such participated in the trial, and that no order of said court was entered permitting that appearance. In addition thereto, there appears in our files as an exhibit the professional card of respondent and his partner, advertising themselves as 'lawyers' and giving their Denver office address and phone number. In view of the foregoing it clearly appears, and the court so finds, that respondent is guilty of practicing law in this state without a license, and without any authority, and contrary to the statutes in such case

Finally, the PDJ recommends that Respondent be assessed \$374.00 in costs, which the PDJ considers reasonable and necessary.¹⁸

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The PDJ **RECOMMENDS** that the Colorado Supreme Court **FIND** that Respondent **JUSTYCE GORDON, a/k/a ANN MARIE GORDON, a/k/a AMANDA GORDON** engaged in the unauthorized practice of law and **ENJOIN** Respondent from the unauthorized practice of law as set forth in C.R.C.P. 232.2(b)-(c).

The PDJ also **RECOMMENDS** that the Colorado Supreme Court **ORDER** Respondent to pay a **FINE** of \$1,500.00 and **COSTS** of \$374.00 within thirty-five days of the date of the Colorado Supreme Court's order.



DATED THIS 21st DAY OF JULY, 2025.


BRYON M. LARGE
PRESIDING DISCIPLINARY JUDGE

made and provided."); *People ex rel. Colorado Bar Ass'n v. Taylor*, 138 P. 762, 763 (Colo. 1914) ("...from these sources it appears that he holds himself out as being licensed to engaged in the general practice of the law, when in fact from his own admissions he is not. This is a clear violation of the statute, the object of which is to protect the public from being imposed upon by unlicensed persons advertising themselves as licensed to conduct lawsuits for clients, and advise them as to their legal rights and obligations."); *see also Disciplinary Counsel v. Casey*, 3 N.E.3d 168, 171 (Ohio 2013) (indicating that use of the honorific "Esq." can contribute to a finding that the person has held himself or herself out as authorized to practice law); *In Re Campbell*, 2013 WL 5200473, at *15 (V.I. Sept. 16, 2013) (same); *In re Mittower*, 693 N.E.2d 555 (Ind. 1998) (holding that designations of "esquire," "general counsel," and "attorney-in-fact," on business cards and letterhead by one who no longer held a license to practice law constituted the unauthorized practice of law); *Kentucky Bar Ass'n v. Brooks*, 325 S.W.3d 283, 289 (Ky. 2010) (same).

¹⁸ See C.R.S. § 13-16-122(1) (setting forth an illustrative list of categories of "includable" costs in civil cases, including "[a]ny fees for service of process").

Copies to:

Michele L. Melnick
Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel

Via Email
m.melnick@csc.state.co.us

Justyce Gordon
Respondent
2311 North Grand Avenue
Pueblo, CO 81003

Via First-Class Mail & Email
onlythebest4u@qualityservice.com

Ann Marie Gordon
2311 North Grand Avenue
Pueblo, CO 81003

Amanda Gordon
2311 North Grand Avenue
Pueblo, CO 81003