

Boulder County Court--Longmont, State of Colorado 1035 Kimbark St., Longmont, CO 80501	DENIED BY COURT 10/02/2026 DATE FILED October 2, 2026 3:51 PM CASE NUMBER: 2026C30766 J KEITH COLLINS District Court Judge ▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲
Petitioner: Christopher S.P. Gregory v. Respondent: Philip J. Weiser	
Counsel for Christopher S.P. Gregory: The Gregory Law Firm, LLC Christopher S.P. Gregory, esq. 201 Coffman St., #1822 Longmont, CO 80502 Phone: (970) 648-0642 Fax: (970) 648-0643 E-Mail: cspgregory@thegregorylawfirm.net Atty. Reg. # 37095	Case No: 26C30766 Division: 11
MOTION TO REQUIRE NOTICE AND DISCLOSURE OF CIRCUMSTANCES RELATED TO CASE ASSIGNMENT	

Comes now Petitioner Christopher S.P. Gregory, *in pro per*, and moves for clarifying and explanatory orders regarding the disqualification of the entire 20th Judicial District from hearing these civil protection order cases.

On October 1, 2026, Petitioner filed this and other related civil protection order cases docketed as Boulder County Court Case Nos. 26C30722 through 26C30767. Contrary to the statutory mandate of § 13-14-104.5(4), C.R.S., these cases were not immediately heard and given priority over all other matters on the Boulder County Court's dockets.

Instead, at the close of business, Chief District Court Judge Nancy W. Salomone issued an order simply stating: "The judicial officers of the 20th Judicial District hereby recuse from this

matter.” The recusal order issued shortly after news that one of the material witnesses involved in Petitioner’s cases, former Justice Melissa Hart, had died.

Chief Judge Salamone’s recusal order does not disclose the process through which a judge will be chosen and assigned to hear Petitioner’s cases, including whether what should otherwise be temporarily protected information will be communicated to the very Respondents against whom Petition seeks temporary civil protection orders. Petitioner is also concerned that Chief Judge Salamone’s recusal order does not disclose what efforts, if any, were made to confirm that *no* individual judge within the 20th Judicial District can hear these matters consistent with his/her obligations under Canons 1.1 (Compliance with the Law), 1.2 (Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary), 2.2 (Impartiality and Fairness), 2.3 (Bias, Prejudice, and Harassment), 2.4 (External Influences on Judicial Conduct), 2.6 (Ensuring the Right to be Heard), 2.7 (Responsibility to Decide), and 2.11(A) (Disqualification) (defining limited circumstances where disqualification required or appropriate) of the Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct.

Under these circumstances, Petitioner requests that this Court provide the following:

1. Disclosure of the individual basis for each judicial officer within the 20th Judicial District recusing himself or herself from hearing Petitioner’s cases. A written explanation of the grounds for disqualification is consistent with the procedures and practices of the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado. D.C.COLO.LCivR 40.1.¹ There are no legitimate reasons why such practices are not being employed here;
2. Explanation of the conflict-free process that will be followed to appoint an outside judge to hear Petitioner’s cases. Because of the sensitivity of the issues and allegations of retaliation by the Justices of the Colorado Supreme Court, the Colorado State Court Administrator’s Office (SCAO), and judges in other judicial districts, it is critical that conflicted individuals not receive notice of these proceedings with any ability to influence the appointment of yet another biased judicial officer to deny Petitioner his

¹ D.C.COLO.LCivR 40.1(f) states: “**Recusal.** Recusal of an active judicial officer shall be by written order stating the reasons.”

fundamental right to be heard. If the existence and substance of Petitioner's cases have already been disclosed to the Colorado Supreme Court and SCAO, the circumstances of the disclosures should be communicated to Petitioner; and

3. Explanation of why the statutorily mandated expedited and priority hearing of complaints for issuance of temporary civil protection orders is not being followed as required by § 13-14-104.5(4), C.R.S.²

Based upon the above-described circumstances and arguments, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court issue clarifying orders in this and Petitioner's other related civil protection order cases.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christopher S.P. Gregory
Christopher S.P. Gregory, Reg. # 37095
Attorney *Pro Per* for Petitioner

Dated: October 1, 2026

² § 13-14-104.5(4), C.R.S. provides:

A motion for a temporary civil protection order ***shall be set for hearing at the earliest possible time***, which hearing may be ex parte, and ***shall take precedence over all matters***, except those matters of the same character that have been on the court docket for a longer period of time. The court ***shall hear all such motions as expeditiously as possible***. (Emphasis added).