

People v. Jeffrey C. Keiffer. 26PDJ22. June 29, 2026.

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge approved the parties' stipulation to discipline and suspended Jeffrey C. Keiffer (attorney registration number 28056) for one year and one day, with six months to be served and the remainder to be stayed upon Keiffer's successful completion of a two-year period of probation, with conditions. Keiffer's suspension takes effect on July 13, 2026.

Keiffer represented defendants in a lawsuit challenging the viability of a settlement agreement between the parties, who had been engaged in a protracted property dispute. During the litigation, a material issue arose over whether an easement gave Keiffer's clients access to a property that the plaintiffs had acquired. In June 2018, the trial court issued an order finding that the settlement agreement was salvageable. But Keiffer and his clients had not disclosed relevant evidence, including emails from the property's former owner showing that he withdrew the easement grant before he sold the property. In addition, Keiffer had submitted a redacted exhibit to the trial court without identifying the redaction. Keiffer did not produce a privilege log regarding the withheld or redacted materials. The evidence came to light later in the case. In an order issued in June 2022, the trial court concluded that the property was not burdened by an easement and that the settlement agreement had failed. In the order, the trial court stated that although it had previously opined that an implied oral easement existed, the court "was not advised of all the facts and certain facts were actively undisclosed by or on behalf of the [defendants]." The trial court sanctioned Keiffer and his clients jointly and severally for failing to disclose the evidence. The parties later settled all issues, including sanctions. Keiffer contributed substantial personal funds to the settlement.

In addition, during the litigation Keiffer filed a motion, which he represented was unopposed. In fact, opposing counsel had notified Keiffer that the motion was opposed. After opposing counsel objected to the inaccurate conferral statement, Keiffer filed a supplement in which he erroneously stated that opposing counsel first raised the opposition after Keiffer filed the motion. The trial court sanctioned Keiffer \$1,588.00 for the misstatement.

Through the conduct described above, Keiffer violated Colo. RPC 1.3 (a lawyer must act with reasonable diligence and promptness when representing a client); Colo. RPC 3.3(a)(1) (a lawyer must not knowingly make a false statement of material fact or law to a tribunal); Colo. RPC 3.4(d) (a lawyer must not, in pretrial procedure, make a frivolous discovery request or fail to make a reasonably diligent effort to comply with an opposing party's legally proper discovery request); Colo. RPC 8.4(c) (it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation); and

Colo. RPC 8.4(d) (it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice).

The case file is public per C.R.C.P. 242.41(a).