

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE, ELECTIONS DIVISION
STATE OF COLORADO

IN THE MATTER OF IRIS HALPERN

L2026-01

MOTION TO DISMISS

The Elections Division of the Secretary of State’s Office (“Division”) moves the Deputy Secretary of State (“Deputy Secretary”) to dismiss the Complaint under Rule 5.5.3 of the Secretary of State’s Rules Concerning Lobbyist Regulation (“the Rules”), as the Division does not have reasonable grounds to believe that a violation of section 24-6-301 et. seq., C.R.S., has occurred.¹

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Bethany Morris (“Complainant”) filed Complaint L2026-01 with the Division on March 11, 2026, under Rule 5.1 of the Rules, alleging Iris Halpern (“Respondent”) had violated Colorado lobbying laws – alleging that Respondent was required to register as a lobbyist with the Secretary of State but did not do so before lobbying.² The Division notified Respondent of the Complaint on the same day it was filed.³

Pursuant to Rule 5.3, the Division issued a Notice of Initial Review and Investigation on March 30, 2026.⁴ The Division determined that Complainant had identified potential violations of Colorado lobbying laws and had alleged sufficient facts to support a basis for those alleged violations.⁵ The Division also advised that it would conduct an investigation under Rule 5.3.2(b).⁶

¹ 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 5.5.3. 8 CCR 1505-8 is titled “Rules Concerning Lobbyist Regulation.” In its investigation of the allegations in a complaint, the Division determines whether “reasonable grounds” exist by making findings of fact from its analysis of the relevant information the Division is able to gather from the respondent, complainant and other sources.

² Exhibit A – Complaint L2026-01. The Division notes that Complainant also filed campaign finance complaint 2026-18 against Respondent, raising the same allegations in both Complaint L2026-01 and Complaint 2026-18. As each Complaint raises allegations of campaign finance violations, those allegations will be addressed in Complaint 2026-18.

³ Exhibit B – Notice of Complaint.

⁴ Exhibit C – Notice of Initial Review and Investigation.

⁵ Exhibit C. See 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 5.3.

⁶ *Id.*

The Division began its investigation on March 30, 2026⁷ and exercised its discretion and extended the investigation under Rule 5.5.2.⁸

During its investigation, the Division sent requests for information to Complainant⁹ and Respondent¹⁰ – both of whom timely responded. Respondent, through her counsel, also sent a letter to the Division addressing the allegations of the Complaint.¹¹ Additionally, Respondent provided 1,745 pages of documentation in response to the Division’s request.¹² The Division has reviewed all of the information provided by both Complainant and Respondent.

During its investigation, the Division additionally researched several databases within the respective websites for the Colorado House and Senate, listened to testimony on various House and Senate bills, researched lobbying databases, and searched the internet generally with relevant key words.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

The Division makes the following factual findings.

I. Complainant’s allegations

Complainant has alleged Respondent lobbied without first registering with the Colorado Secretary of State.¹³ Complainant claims Respondent has lobbied for either the law firm that employs her, Rathod Mohamedbhai, or the Colorado Women’s Bar Association throughout the past eight years.¹⁴ Complainant then lists the following in the Complaint:

- Testimony to the House Judiciary Committee on February 4th, 2025 supporting HB25-1138 on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association.

- Testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 29, 2024 supporting HB24-1372 on behalf of Rathod Mohamedbhai.

⁷ Exhibit C.

⁸ Exhibit D - Notices of Investigation Deadline Extensions. Rule 5.5.2 authorizes the Division, at its discretion, to extend the time to investigate a complaint. The Division did so twice – extending the investigation for thirty days on each occasion. Exhibit D.

⁹ Exhibit E – Complainant’s responses.

¹⁰ Exhibit F – Respondent’s responses.

¹¹ Exhibit F at 15-27.

¹² Exhibit G – Respondent’s documentation.

¹³ Exhibit A.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 2.

- Testimony to the Senate Education Committee on February 26th, 2024 supporting SB24-049 on behalf of Rathod Mohamedbhai.
- Testimony to the House Judiciary Committee on April 25th, 2023 supporting SB23-172 on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association.
- Testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 5th, 2023 supporting SB23-172 on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association.
- Testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 3rd, 2022 supporting HB22-1367 on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association
- Testimony to the House Judiciary Committee on April 19th, 2022 supporting HB22-1367 on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association
- Testimony to the House Health and Insurance Committee on April 6th, 2022 opposing HB22-1100 on behalf of Rathod Mohamedbhai.
- Testimony to the House Judiciary Committee on June 3rd, 2021 supporting SB21-176 on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association.
- Testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 6th, 2021 supporting SB21-176 on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association.
- Testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 1st, 2021 supporting SB21-176 on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association.
- Testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 18th, 2018 supporting HB18-1256 on behalf of the Colorado Trial Lawyer Association.
- Testimony to the House Judiciary Committee on March 13th, 2018 supporting HB18-1256 on behalf of the Colorado Trial Lawyer Association.¹⁵

Complainant has also alleged Respondent’s campaign website “lists a ‘Bills I Have Worked On’ section that includes her lobbying efforts for: SB26-005, HB25-1138, HB24-1372, SB24-216, SB23-296, SB23-172, HB22-1367.”¹⁶

In its first request for information, the Division asked Complainant if she knew whether, aside from testifying about a bill, Respondent communicated with members of the General Assembly, the director of research of the legislative council of the General Assembly, or any member of

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Id.*

legislative council staff regarding any of the bills referenced in the Complaints.¹⁷ Complainant stated that she did not.¹⁸ The Division also asked Complainant if she knew whether Respondent was asked to provide any information to members of the General Assembly, the director of research of the legislative council of the General Assembly, or any member of legislative council staff regarding any of the bills referenced in the Complaints.¹⁹ Complainant stated that she did not know.²⁰

II. Respondent and her legislative activities

Respondent is a practicing attorney at the law firm of Rathod Mohamedbhai LLC of Denver, Colorado (“law firm”).²¹ Respondent began working at the law firm in January 2018 and became a partner of the law firm in January 2021.²² Respondent specializes in employment and student discrimination cases, with expertise in constitutional law, employment and education antidiscrimination, and employment wage, hour, and leave laws.²³ Before working for the law firm, Respondent worked at the Denver Field Office of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, serving as the senior trial attorney and an acting supervisory attorney.

Since 2018, Respondent has received her income on a W-2 basis from the law firm.²⁴ She currently receives a base salary similar to the base salary of all other partners at the law firm. As a firm partner, Respondent also receives one percent of the fees that come from litigation undertaken by the law firm. She is also eligible to receive W-2 compensation for internal case referrals.

The law firm, through the sole discretion of its founding partners, occasionally pays out bonuses depending on the firm’s financial status and the status of its legal work for its clients.²⁵ Additionally, “[t]he firm’s exclusive source of income is amounts recovered in connection with litigation; and bonuses are contingent on this income.”²⁶

Aside from her work for the law firm, Respondent has testified on a variety of topics before the Colorado General Assembly. Respondent has also worked directly with legislators to draft legislation, as discussed further below.

¹⁷ Exhibit E at 2.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 5.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 2.

²⁰ *Id.* at 5.

²¹ [Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel](#) and <https://rmlawyers.com/attorneys/iris-halpern>.

²² Exhibit F at 12-13.

²³ <https://rmlawyers.com/attorneys/iris-halpern>.

²⁴ Exhibit F at 13.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*

In response to the Division's requests for information, Respondent provided over 1,700 pages of documentation (emails and Zoom²⁷ meeting invitations).²⁸ The Division has reviewed all of Respondent's submissions. All of the information provided by Respondent shows that Respondent has engaged in the legislative process in three ways.

First, Respondent has testified on numerous occasions. Of the bills raised in the Complaint, Respondent has testified a total of fifteen times. In each instance, Respondent identified herself and the entity she was testifying on behalf of. For example, in 2018, Respondent testified on behalf of the Colorado Trial Lawyers Association to support HB18-1256.²⁹ HB18-1256 continued the Colorado Civil Rights Division and the Colorado Civil Rights Commission and their respective functions for 9 years, through September 1, 2027.³⁰ In 2022, Respondent testified on behalf of herself and the law firm in opposition of HB22-1100, a bill that would have prohibited an employer from taking adverse action against an employee based on the employee's COVID-19 immunization status.³¹ In 2025, Respondent testified on behalf of the Colorado Women's Bar Association in support of HB25-1138.³² HB25-1138 prohibits the admission of evidence of the victim's manner of dress, hairstyle, mode or manner of speech, or lifestyle as evidence of the victim's consent, credibility, or the existence or extent of damages or harm in a civil sex misconduct suit.³³

Second, Respondent has served as an attorney for two of her clients to arrange their testimony before committees of the General Assembly. In 2024, Representative Leslie Herod sponsored HB24-1372, a bill regulating the use of prone restraint by law enforcement.³⁴ Respondent represented Sheneen McClain, whose son, Elijah McClain was killed by the Aurora Police Department.³⁵ Representative Herod worked with Respondent and Ms. McClain to arrange Ms. McClain's testimony before the House and Senate Judiciary Committees.³⁶

In another example in 2024, Senator Lisa Cutter sponsored SB24-049, a bill that would have established a process by which a student, parent, or member of the community could object to a

²⁷ Zoom is a software platform that allows users to hold video and audio conferences. See <https://www.zoom.com/en/about>.

²⁸ Exhibit G.

²⁹ [Respondent's testimony on HB18-1256 before the Senate Judiciary Committee Apr. 18, 2018 at 4:55:30](#) and [Respondent's testimony on HB18-1256 before the House Judiciary Committee Mar. 13, 2018 at 4:18:30](#).

³⁰ [Colorado General Assembly's Bill Summary for HB18-1256](#).

³¹ [Respondent's testimony on HB22-1100 before the House Health and Insurance Committee Apr. 6, 2025 at 4:28:36](#) and [Colorado General Assembly's Bill Summary for HB22-1100](#).

³² [Respondent's testimony on HB25-1138 before the House Judiciary Committee Feb. 4, 2025 at 1:42:15](#).

³³ [Colorado General Assembly's Bill Summary for HB25-1138](#).

³⁴ [Colorado General Assembly's Bill Summary for HB24-1372](#).

³⁵ Exhibit F at 7.

³⁶ *Id.* See also [House Judiciary Hearing Summary for HB24-1372](#) and [Senate Judiciary Hearing Summary for HB24-1372](#).

library resource in a school or public library.³⁷ The bill did not pass out of committee.³⁸ Senator Cutter also sponsored its successor bill, SB24-216, a bill that set standards that public libraries are required to include in policies regarding library resources.³⁹ Respondent represented Brooky Parks, a librarian who was previously fired for starting the “Read Woke” book club, which focused on LGBTQ-themed books.⁴⁰ Respondent contacted Senator Cutter to discuss the bill and worked with Senator Cutter’s legislative aide to arrange for both Respondent’s and Ms. Park’s testimony in support of the bills.⁴¹

Third, Respondent has worked directly with members of the General Assembly to discuss legal issues surrounding proposed legislation. For example, on April 1, 2021, Respondent testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee on behalf of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association in support of SB21-176.⁴² SB21-176, titled Protecting Opportunities And Workers' Rights Act (“POWR”), addressed protections for Colorado workers against discriminatory employment practices.⁴³ Following Respondent’s testimony, Senator Pete Lee, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, reached out by Zoom to conference with Respondent and the then president of the Colorado Women’s Bar Association.⁴⁴ Senator Lee discussed ways in which to compromise to pass the bill.⁴⁵ The bill ultimately failed.⁴⁶

In 2023, Respondent received a call from Representative Jennifer Bacon’s staff about SB23-296.⁴⁷ SB23-296 established protections and protocols for students against discriminatory practices at school.⁴⁸ Representative Bacon’s staff contacted Respondent to discuss “severe” and “pervasive” and how those legal standards apply differently in employment and school settings.⁴⁹ In what appears to be follow-up from that phone conversation, Respondent emailed Representative Bacon with additional information about caselaw addressing harassment, differing definitions of harassment in other states, and First Amendment concerns.⁵⁰

³⁷ [Colorado General Assembly’s Bill Summary for SB24-049.](#)

³⁸ [Senate Committee Hearing Summary for SB24-049.](#)

³⁹ [Colorado General Assembly’s Bill Summary for SB24-216.](#)

⁴⁰ “[Librarians, who lost jobs for not banning books, are fighting back](#),” NPR.org, accessed May 27, 2026.

⁴¹ Exhibit G at 21, and 25-28. See also [Respondent’s testimony on SB24-216 before the Senate Judiciary Committee Apr. 29, 2024 at 7:15:36](#) and [Brooky Parks’ testimony on SB24-216 before the Senate Judiciary Committee Apr. 29, 2024 at 7:26:08.](#)

⁴² [Respondent’s testimony on SB23-296 before the Senate Judiciary Committee Apr. 1, 2021 at 10:50:32.](#)

⁴³ [Colorado General Assembly’s Bill Summary for SB21-176.](#)

⁴⁴ Exhibit F at 5.

⁴⁵ *Id.*

⁴⁶ [Colorado General Assembly’s Bill Summary for SB21-176.](#)

⁴⁷ Exhibit F at 7.

⁴⁸ [Colorado General Assembly’s Bill Summary for SB23-296.](#)

⁴⁹ Exhibit F at 6.

⁵⁰ Exhibit G at 297-298.

In 2024, Representative Bacon introduced HB24-1460, a bill concerning measures to strengthen responses to law enforcement misconduct.⁵¹ Then Representative Mike Weissman⁵² worked with Respondent, through a series of emails, in efforts to save the bill from defeat.⁵³ Respondent provided information concerning civil suit damages, caselaw, and options to modify the HB24-1460.⁵⁴

III. Respondent has never received compensation for legislative activities and has never registered as a lobbyist.

Respondent states that she has never received compensation – by salary, increase in salary, bonus, share of profits, or even a reimbursement for expenses – for her legislative activities before the General Assembly.⁵⁵ Nor has Respondent received any form of compensation for her communications with members of the General Assembly, the director of research of the legislative council of the General Assembly, or any member of legislative council staff.⁵⁶ None of the documentation provided by Respondent indicates that Respondent was ever paid for her time working on legislation or working with members of the General Assembly, the director of research of the legislative council of the General Assembly, or any member of legislative council staff.⁵⁷

Although Respondent has been actively involved in the legislative process since at least 2018, Respondent indicates that she has never registered as a lobbyist.⁵⁸ Respondent states she has never been a lobbyist, served as a lobbyist, been paid to be a lobbyist, worked as a volunteer lobbyist, or ever had any lobbying client.

ANALYSIS

The Division moves the Deputy Secretary to dismiss the Complaint pursuant to Rule 5.5.3 of the Rules as the Division does not have reasonable grounds to believe Respondent violated section 24-6-301 et. seq., C.R.S.⁵⁹

⁵¹ [Colorado General Assembly's Bill Summary for HB24-1460.](#)

⁵² Weissman won an election for state senator in November 2024. [Secretary of State's Historical Election Data.](#)

⁵³ Exhibit G at 1617-1618.

⁵⁴ *Id.*

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 13-14.

⁵⁶ *Id.*

⁵⁷ See Exhibit G.

⁵⁸ Exhibit F at 4.

⁵⁹ 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 5.5.3. The standard the Division must use to determine whether to file a motion to dismiss is whether the Division has reasonable grounds to believe a violation of Colorado lobbying laws has occurred. If the Division does not believe reasonable grounds exist, it must file a motion to dismiss. 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 5.5.3. See Footnote 1 on page 1 of this Motion.

I. Legal Standard

Section 24-6-301 et. seq., C.R.S., is part of Colorado’s Sunshine Law and pertains to the regulation of lobbyists.⁶⁰ Any person who believes that there has been a violation of Colorado’s lobbyist regulation laws may file a complaint with the Division pursuant to Rule 5.1.⁶¹ If the Division determines that the complaint meets certain requirements, it must conduct an investigation of the alleged violation(s).⁶² If after the investigation the Division does not have reasonable grounds to believe that a violation of Section 24-6-301 et. seq., C.R.S., has occurred, the Division must file a motion to dismiss the complaint with the Secretary or the Secretary’s designee.⁶³

II. Applicable Law

Section 24-6-303(1), C.R.S., states:

- (1) Before lobbying, a professional lobbyist shall file an electronic registration statement with the secretary of state that contains:
 - (a) His or her full legal name, business address, and business telephone number;
 - (b) The name, address, and telephone number of his or her employer, if applicable;
 - (c) The name, address, and telephone number of the client for whom he or she will be lobbying; and
 - (d) The name, address, and telephone number of any other professional lobbyist for whom he or she is lobbying on a subcontract basis.⁶⁴

In relevant part, section 24-6-301(3.5)(a)(I) defines “lobbying” to mean communicating directly (or soliciting others to communicate) with a “covered official” for the purpose of aiding in or influencing that covered official in “the drafting, introduction, sponsorship, consideration, debate, amendment, passage, defeat, approval, or veto” on:

- (A) any bill, resolution, amendment, nomination, appointment, or report, whether or not in writing, pending or proposed for consideration by either house of the Colorado General Assembly, or committee thereof, or;

⁶⁰ Article 6 of Title 24, C.R.S., is Colorado’s Sunshine Law.

⁶¹ 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 5.1.

⁶² 8 CCR 1505-8, Rules 5.31 and 5.3.2.

⁶³ 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 5.5.3. The Deputy Secretary is the designee of the Secretary for the purpose of determining whether to dismiss the complaint. Dismissal of the complaint is final agency action.

⁶⁴ Rule 2.1.1 also requires that a professional lobbyist register before lobbying. 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 2.1.1.

(B) any other matter pending or proposed in writing by a covered official for consideration by either house of the General Assembly, or committee thereof.⁶⁵

A “covered official” includes a member of the Colorado General Assembly, among others.⁶⁶

There are three relevant exclusions to the definition of lobbying. The first two exclusions arise under section 24-6-301(3.5)(d)(III)(B), C.R.S., which states:

‘[I]obbying’ excludes persons who are not otherwise registered as lobbyists and [1] who limit their activities to appearances to give testimony or provide information to committees of the general assembly or at public hearings of state agencies or [2] who give testimony or provide information at the request of public officials or employees and who clearly identify themselves and the interest for whom they are testifying or providing information.⁶⁷

The third exclusion is found in section 24-6-301(3.5)(e), C.R.S., which states, “ ‘[I]obbying’ does not include communications made by an attorney-at-law when such communications are made on behalf of a client whose name has been identified and when such communications constitute the practice of law subject to control by the judicial branch of the state of Colorado.”

The registration requirements of Section 24-6-303(1), C.R.S., apply only to a “professional lobbyist.” Section 24-6-301(6), C.R.S., defines a “professional lobbyist” as “a person, business entity, including a sole proprietorship, or an employee of a client, who is compensated by a client or another professional lobbyist for lobbying.”

A “client” is “the person who employs or retains the professional services of one or more lobbyists to undertake lobbying on behalf of that person.”⁶⁸ The definition also limits when a professional lobbyist can be a client.⁶⁹

Rule 1.7 further refines the definition of “professional lobbyist.”⁷⁰ Rule 1.7 requires that a lobbyist must be compensated by either a client or another professional lobbyist before that

⁶⁵ Section 24-6-301(3.5)(a), C.R.S. The definition of “lobbying” includes other activities that do not apply to Complaint L2026-01.

⁶⁶ Section 24-6-301(1.7), C.R.S.

⁶⁷ The bracketed numbers have been added to separate the two exclusions for the reader.

⁶⁸ Section 24-6-301(1), C.R.S. Section 24-6-301(4), C.R.S., defines “person” broadly to include individuals and various types of organizations, associations, and other entities.

⁶⁹ Section 24-6-301(1), C.R.S.

⁷⁰ 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 1.7.

lobbyist is considered a professional lobbyist.⁷¹ Rule 1.7 also adds “lobbying firm” as another source of compensation to a professional lobbyist.⁷²

Section 24-6-301(3.6), C.R.S., defines a “lobbying firm” as:

a person or entity employing one or more professional lobbyists to lobby on behalf of a client that is not the person or entity. Lobbying firms include a self-employed professional lobbyist.

Under Colorado law, a lobbying firm is not required to register.⁷³ However, a lobbying firm must file certain disclosure reports with the Secretary of State.⁷⁴

Unlike a professional lobbyist, a “volunteer lobbyist” is not required to register with the Secretary of State before lobbying.⁷⁵ Section 24-6-301(7), C.R.S., defines “volunteer lobbyist” as:

any individual who engages in lobbying *and* whose only receipt of money or other thing of value consists of nothing more than reimbursement for actual and reasonable expenses incurred for personal needs, such as meals, travel, lodging, and parking, while engaged in lobbying or for actual expenses incurred in informing the organization making the reimbursement or the members thereof of his lobbying.⁷⁶

Underlying both a volunteer lobbyist and a professional lobbyist is that they receive some compensation – a professional lobbyist is compensated from a client, another professional lobbyist, or lobbying firm⁷⁷ and a volunteer lobbyist receives reimbursement for their own expenses.⁷⁸

⁷¹ *Id.*

⁷² Rule 1.7 states: “Professional lobbyist means a person, business entity, including a sole proprietorship, or an employee of a client, who is compensated by a client, another professional lobbyist or lobbying firm for lobbying services.”

⁷³ 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 3.1.1.

⁷⁴ 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 3.2.

⁷⁵ Section 24-6-303(6), C.R.S. and 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 2.2.1(a). However, a volunteer lobbyist must register with the General Assembly.

⁷⁶ Emphasis added.

⁷⁷ Section 24-6-301(6), C.R.S. and 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 1.7.

⁷⁸ Section 24-6-301(7), C.R.S.

III. Respondent’s testimony was not lobbying.

The Division does not have reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent was required to register with the Secretary of State for testifying before the General Assembly because her testimony was not lobbying.⁷⁹

Under section 24-6-301(3.5)(d)(III)(B), C.R.S.,

‘[1]obbying’ excludes persons who are not otherwise registered as lobbyists and [1] who limit their activities to appearances to give testimony or provide information to committees of the general assembly or at public hearings of state agencies or [2] who give testimony or provide information at the request of public officials or employees and who clearly identify themselves and the interest for whom they are testifying or providing information.⁸⁰

Complainant’s only allegations are that Respondent testified before the General Assembly and by doing so Respondent was required to register with the Secretary of State.⁸¹ But each time Respondent testified, she clearly identified herself and the interest she testified on behalf of.⁸² Therefore, Respondent’s testimony was not lobbying.⁸³

IV. Respondent’s representation of two clients was not lobbying.

The Division does not have reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent’s representation of Sheneen McClain or Brooky Parks required Respondent to register with the Secretary of State because her representation was not lobbying.⁸⁴

Under section 24-6-301(3.5)(e), lobbying does not include “communications made by an attorney-at-law when such communications are made on behalf of a client whose name has been identified and when such communications constitute the practice of law subject to control by the judicial branch of the state of Colorado.”

In regard to HB24-1372, Respondent was acting in a representative capacity as the attorney for her client, Sheneen McClain, as Respondent was attempting to arrange for her client to testify

⁷⁹ The standard the Division is required to use to determine whether it must file a motion to dismiss is whether the Division has reasonable grounds to believe a violation of Colorado lobbying laws has occurred. 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 5.5.3.

⁸⁰ The bracketed numbers have been added to separate the two exceptions for the reader.

⁸¹ See Exhibit A at 2 and Exhibit E at 5.

⁸² *Supra* footnotes 32, 34, and 35.

⁸³ See Section 24-6-301(3.5)(d)(III)(B), C.R.S.

⁸⁴ See section 24-6-301(3.5)(e), C.R.S.

before committees of the General Assembly.⁸⁵ As to SB24-049 and SB 24-216, Respondent was also acting in a representative capacity as the attorney for her client Brooky Parks. Respondent was again attempting to arrange for her client to testify before committees of the General Assembly.⁸⁶ Respondent representation was not lobbying.⁸⁷

V. Respondent was not a professional lobbyist and therefore did not need to register with the Secretary of State because Respondent never received compensation for her legislative activities.

The Division does not have reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent was required to register with the Secretary of State because Respondent was not a professional lobbyist.⁸⁸

The Division notes that it is a close question as to whether Respondent’s communications with members of the General Assembly constitute lobbying. At least some of those communications were to provide information at the request of those public officials.⁸⁹ However, its less clear as to whether Respondent identified who she was providing information on behalf of – as some of the communications by phone were made many years ago.⁹⁰

Even so, the facts here establish that Respondent was not subject to lobbying registration requirements because Respondent was not a professional lobbyist.

To violate the registration requirement under Colorado lobbying laws, a person must meet the definition of a professional lobbyist under section 24-6-301(6), C.R.S. To fall within the definition of a professional lobbyist, a person must lobby as defined in section 24-6-301(3.5), C.R.S., **and** be compensated for lobbying.⁹¹

Section 24-6-301(6), C.R.S., in relevant part defines a “professional lobbyist” as:

a person, business entity, including a sole proprietorship, or an employee of a client, who is **compensated** by a client or another professional lobbyist **for lobbying**. ‘Professional lobbyist’ does not include any volunteer lobbyist⁹²

⁸⁵ See Exhibit F at 7.

⁸⁶ See Exhibit G at 21, and 25-28.

⁸⁷ See section 24-6-301(3.5)(e), C.R.S.

⁸⁸ The standard the Division is required to use to determine whether it must file a motion to dismiss is whether the Division has reasonable grounds to believe a violation of Colorado lobbying laws has occurred. 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 5.5.3.

⁸⁹ See e.g., Exhibit F at 5-6, Exhibit G at 297-298, and Exhibit G at 1617-1618.

⁹⁰ See Exhibit F at 5-6.

⁹¹ Section 24-6-301(6), C.R.S. Emphasis added.

⁹² Emphasis added.

The compensation must come from a client, another professional lobbyist, or a lobbying firm and compensation must be for lobbying.⁹³ Therefore, Respondent would not violate Colorado's requirement that professional lobbyists register with the Secretary unless Respondent was compensated from certain sources for lobbying.

Even if some of Respondent's communications with members of the General Assembly could be considered lobbying, Respondent received no compensation for her efforts. Since January 2018, Respondent has been a salaried employee of the law firm.⁹⁴ The firm's exclusive form of income is generated from amounts recovered for litigation.⁹⁵ Respondent has never received any compensation for her legislative activities, whether in the form of salary, bonuses, shares of profit, or otherwise.⁹⁶ Instead, Respondent volunteered her time to testify in the General Assembly and to communicate with members of the General Assembly.⁹⁷

Because Respondent's time was voluntary and she received no compensation for her legislative activities, Respondent did not meet the definition of a professional lobbyist.⁹⁸ Therefore, Respondent had no responsibility to register as a professional lobbyist.⁹⁹ The Division does not have reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent violated section 24-6-303, C.R.S., by failing to register with the Secretary before she engaged in her legislative activities and communications with members of the General Assembly.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the Division moves to dismiss the Complaint because the Division does not have reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent violated any provision of Colorado section 24-6-301 et. seq., C.R.S.

Dated this 2nd day of June, 2026.

/s/ Alex Gentry
Alex Gentry
Campaign Finance Enforcement Analyst
Elections Division
Colorado Secretary of State

⁹³ 8 CCR 1505-8, Rule 7.1.

⁹⁴ Exhibit F at 13.

⁹⁵ *Id.*

⁹⁶ *Id.*

⁹⁷ See *id.* and see generally Exhibit G.

⁹⁸ See Section 24-6-301(6), C.R.S.

⁹⁹ See Section 24-6-303(1), C.R.S.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and correct copy of this Motion to Dismiss was served by electronic transmission this 2nd day of June, 2026, to:

Deputy Secretary of State -

Andrew Kline

Andrew.Kline@ColoradoSOS.gov

Complainant –

Bethany Morris

bethany@bethanyrosemorris.com

Respondent –

Iris Halpern

c/o Attorney Joshua Weiss

jweiss@bhfs.com

/s/ Alex Gentry

Alex Gentry

Campaign Finance Enforcement Analyst

Elections Division

Colorado Secretary of State