

**JEFFERSON COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
DIVISION 7**

**Court Address:
100 Jefferson County Parkway
Golden, Colorado 80401**

**Case No.:
97DR1971**

In re the Marriage of:

**CHARLES E. CORRY,
Petitioner**

And

**THERESA CORRY,
Respondent.**

**Ctrm.: 4A
Div. 7**

ORDER

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Petitioner's Motion for Declaratory Judgment Concerning Compliance with Permanent Orders and Respondent's Motion for Writ of Execution and for Attorney's Fees and Costs. The Court, having reviewed the motions, documentation and applicable law, dispenses with oral argument. Petitioner's Motion for Declaratory Judgment Concerning Compliance with Permanent Orders and Respondent's Motion for Writ of Execution and for Attorney's Fees and Costs are DENIED.

COPY TO CLIENT

DATE SENT 7/12/02

BY YAS email

From all appearances, this is a tragic case of continued abuse of the legal process by two financially comfortable people. The parties are apparently willing to pay substantial sums to lawyers for little purpose other than the continuing generation of vitriolic rhetoric.

This Court has repeatedly expressed its displeasure at the unprofessional tone taken by the attorneys in this case. For example, see the second paragraph of Judge Boatright's order of November 30, 2000, a copy of which is attached.

This case involves a short-term marriage with no children. The court file has expanded to three (3) volumes. The Permanent Order was appealed to the Colorado Court of Appeals without success and certiorari to the Colorado Supreme Court was sought without success.

One of the parties sought a civil law tort against the other in another judicial district, again without success.


Now, they seek yet another opportunity to consume public resources by again paying their lawyers to continue this wasteful dispute. The Court has broad discretion in determining whether actions for declaratory relief should be entertained. In this case, the Court doubts that any useful purpose would be served.

These parties might be well served by expending their funds upon professional assistance with the task of putting this unhappy relationship behind them and moving on with their lives. If the past is a good prediction of the future, however, further litigation remains a possibility. I would expect any magistrate of this court to consider the history of this case in determining whether future motions, including applications for contempt citations, might be vexatious or frivolous.

Each attorney is hereby directed to supply a copy of this order to their client, and to explain the significance of any finding that a motion has been frivolously or vexatiously brought or maintained.

Done in Golden, Colorado this 10th day of July, 2002.

BY THE COURT:



Christopher J. Munch
District Judge

ORDER

In re the Marriage of:

CHARLES E. CORRY,
Petitioner,

and

THERESA CORRY,
Respondent.

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on a number of motions related to post-decree discovery. The Court, having reviewed the motions, the Court file including the Court of Appeals opinion, applicable law and rules, dispenses with oral argument and issues the following order.

First, the Court denies the Motion to Permit Supplemental Response to Respondent's Patently False Allegations, With Supplemental Response. The Court does not need any more documentation to advise this Court in inflammatory rhetoric that counsel does not like nor trust each other. The additional information is not helpful nor persuasive and in fact is distracting to this Court.


The Court will grant the Motion for Post-Decree Discovery as submitted. The Court finds the timing reasonable and the requested information and its scope reasonable. The Court denies the request for sanctions. The Court denies any request for oral argument.

The Court denies the Verified Motion to Compel, For Sanctions and Attorneys Fees. The Court finds an order to comply with an order is not the proper procedure. If the Petitioner has failed to comply with the permanent orders, she is granted leave to file a motion for contempt.

The Court at this time will deny attorney fees. The Court is unable to determine the appropriate responsible party or attorney for the level of animosity that clearly exists in this case.

Done in Golden, Colorado this 30th day of November 2000.

BY THE COURT:



Brian D. Boatright
District Judge

DOCKETED