

Colorado Supreme Court 2 East 14th Avenue Denver, CO 80203	DATE FILED: November 15, 2021 CASE NUMBER: 2021SA249
Original Proceeding in Unauthorized Practice of Law, 20UPL66	
Petitioner: The People of the State of Colorado, v. Respondent: Gregory E. Nidy.	Supreme Court Case No: 2021SA249
ORDER OF INJUNCTION	

Upon consideration of the Stipulation, Agreement and Affidavit Consenting to an Order of Injunction filed in the above cause, and now being sufficiently advised in the premises,

IT IS ORDERED that GREGORY E. NIDY shall be, and the same hereby is, ENJOINED from engaging in the unauthorized practice of law, in the state of Colorado.

BY THE COURT, NOVEMBER 15, 2021.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO
2 East 14th Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING IN UNAUTHORIZED
PRACTICE OF LAW 20UPL66

Petitioner:
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Respondent:
GREGORY E. NIDY

Jacob M. Vos, #41562
Assistant Regulation Counsel
Jessica E. Yates, #38003
Attorney Regulation Counsel
Attorneys for Petitioner
1300 Broadway, Suite 500
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: (303) 928-7811
Fax No.: (303) 501-1141
Email: j.vos@csc.state.co.us

Gregory E. Nidy
7037 Otis Street
Arvada, CO 80003-3601
Telephone: (303) 422-3613
E-mail: nidy.greg@gmail.com

▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲

Case Number:
21SA000249

**STIPULATION, AGREEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT CONSENTING TO AN
ORDER OF INJUNCTION**

On this 12th day of ~~August~~^{SEPTEMBER} 2021, Jacob M. Vos, Assistant Regulation Counsel, and Gregory E. Nidy, Respondent, enter into the following stipulation, agreement, and affidavit consenting to entry of an order of injunction

(“stipulation”), and submit the same to the Colorado Supreme Court for a finding and order of injunction pursuant to C.R.C.P. 229-237.

1. The respondent resides at 7037 Otis Street, Arvada, CO 80003-3601. The respondent is not licensed to practice law in the State of Colorado or any state.

2. Respondent enters into this stipulation freely and voluntarily. No promises have been made concerning future consideration, punishment, or lenience in the above-referenced matter. It is the respondent’s personal decision, and Respondent affirms there has been no coercion or other intimidating acts by any person or agency concerning this matter.

3. Respondent is familiar with the rules of the Colorado Supreme Court regarding the unauthorized practice of law. The respondent acknowledges the right to a full and complete evidentiary hearing on the above-referenced petition for injunction. At any such hearing, the respondent would have the right to be represented by counsel, present evidence, call witnesses, and cross-examine the witnesses presented by the Petitioner. At any such formal hearing, the Petitioner would have the burden of proof and would be required to prove the charges contained in the petition for injunction by a preponderance of the evidence. Nonetheless having full knowledge of the right to such a formal hearing, Respondent waives that right.

4. The respondent understands that the practice of law in Colorado includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. providing advice to any other individual on the legal effect of any proposed action in a legal matter; or assisting that individual in making decisions that require legal judgment and a knowledge of the law that is greater than the average citizen;
- b. providing advice to any other individual as to various legal remedies available to that individual and the possible legal courses of action for that individual;
- c. acting in a representative capacity on behalf of any other individual in matters that affect that individual’s legal rights and duties;

- d. selecting or preparing any legal document for any other individual, other than solely as a typist; and, without limiting the above, explaining to that individual or any other individual the legal significance of such document;
- e. holding oneself out as an attorney, lawyer, “esquire”, immigration consultant, or legal consultant, either directly or impliedly;
- f. holding oneself out to others in a manner that another individual would place some reliance on the Respondent to handle that individual’s legal matters;
- g. advertising oneself as an immigration consultant, or being able to select and prepare immigration paperwork on behalf of others (without U.S.B.I.A. accreditation);
- h. making an appearance or speaking on behalf of another individual in negotiations, settlement conferences, mediations, hearings, trials, oral arguments or other legal proceedings unless specifically allowed by the rules that apply to such appearance in such legal proceeding;
- i. serving as a conduit or intermediary on behalf of any other individual for the obtaining or relaying of any legal counsel;
- j. conducting the business of management of a law practice to the extent that the exercise of legal judgment on behalf of another occurs; and
- k. soliciting or accepting any fees for legal services.

5. Respondent and the Petitioner stipulate to the facts and conclusions in the attached Petition. *See* Ex. 1.

6. Petitioner does not request restitution, and as of this writing, Petitioner has not incurred any costs pursuant to C.R.C.P. 237(a).

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO
2 E. 14th Ave.
Denver, Colorado 80203

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING IN UNAUTHORIZED
PRACTICE OF LAW, 20UPL66

Petitioner:
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Respondents:
GREGORY E. NIDY

Jacob M. Vos, #41562
Assistant Regulation Counsel
Jessica E. Yates, #38003
Attorney Regulation Counsel
Attorneys for Complainant
1300 Broadway, Suite 500
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: (303) 928-7811
Fax No.: (303) 501-1141
j.vos@csc.state.co.us

▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲

Case Number:

PETITION FOR INJUNCTION

Petitioner, through the undersigned Assistant Regulation Counsel, and upon authorization pursuant to C.R.C.P. 234,¹ respectfully requests that the Colorado Supreme Court issue an order pursuant to C.R.C.P. 234(c) directing Respondent to show cause why he should not be enjoined from the unauthorized practice of law. As grounds, counsel states as follows:

¹ The Unauthorized Practice of Law (“UPL”) Committee authorized the filing of this petition on July 16, 2021.

JURISDICTION

1. Respondent Gregory E. Nidy is a Colorado resident, with a last known address of 7037 Otis Street, Arvada, CO 80003-3601.

2. Respondent Gregory E. Nidy is not licensed to practice law in Colorado or any other state.

3. Respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law, as described below.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

4. Anthony Veto is a longtime Colorado attorney. He operates a solo practice focusing primarily on family law and criminal defense.

5. Mr. Veto employed Respondent Gregory Nidy as a paralegal and legal assistant between approximately 2017 and 2021.

6. Mr. Nidy is a graduate of Taft Law School, an online law school based in Santa Ana, California, which is not accredited by the American Bar Association.

7. Mr. Veto and Mr. Nidy were involved in a domestic relations matter between Jermaine Thomas, represented by Mr. Veto, and Ashlie Holden, who was *pro se* for a time but who was later represented by attorney Craig Chambers.

8. Ms. Holden was *pro se* during an August 27, 2020 hearing in the matter.

9. The hearing addressed Mr. Thomas's motion to restrict parenting time.

10. Mr. Veto appeared during that hearing and introduced Mr. Nidy as his "legal lawyer assistant."

11. At one point in the hearing Mr. Veto offered ten letters into evidence, and the Court asked him to explain why the letters were not hearsay and admissible.

12. The following colloquy ensued:

THE COURT: Tell me why those letters are not hearsay and why they could be admitted.

MR. VETO: I'm going to let my -- I'm going to let my lawyer assistant argue that point, if you don't mind.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. VETO: He's already researched it.

MR. NIDY: Your Honor, we believe that these would fall outside of the hearsay exception under the Colorado Rules of Evidence 804(a)(4). These witnesses through --

THE COURT: Sir --

MR. NIDY: -- these statements will directly refute evidence that she --

THE COURT: Sir --

MR. NIDY: -- have collected --

THE COURT: -- I'm just going to interrupt you for a second. Can you tell me your name again for the record, please.

MR. NIDY: Your Honor -- inaudible.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, you're breaking up, I couldn't hear you. If you could tell me one more time.

MR. NIDY: Okay. Your Honor, Gregory Nidy, N-I-D-Y.

THE COURT: N-I-E-Y?

MR. NIDY: D delta Y yellow.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Nidy, what's your registration number?

MR. NIDY: I'm Texas student attorney 24103459 and I am a clerk for Mr. Veto.

THE COURT: Are you authorized to practice in Colorado under the Student Practice Act?

MR. NIDY: CRCP 207, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Nidy, you can go ahead and make your argument about the letters.

13. Mr. Nidy went on to argue the applicability of CRE 804(a)(4).

14. Colorado's Student Practice Act is found in Rule 205.7.

15. Subsection (b) to that Rule sets the eligibility requirements for law student extern practice.

16. The Rule requires the law student to be "Be duly enrolled in an ABA accredited law school, or a recent graduate of such a law school who has applied for admission to the Colorado Bar."

17. Mr. Nidy was neither.

18. The Rule also requires the extern to have a certification from the accredited law school's dean. *See id.* at (b)(i)(C).

19. Mr. Nidy had no such certification.

20. Mr. Nidy was not authorized to represent anyone under Colorado's Law Student Practice Act or any other body of Colorado law.

21. Later, during a September 15, 2020 hearing in the matter, Ms. Holden was still *pro se*.

22. Mr. Veto appeared, along with Mr. Nidy, who Mr. Veto introduced to the court as his "lawyer assistant."

23. The parties addressed at the hearing what to do with the parties' home – Mr. Thomas wanted to buy Ms. Holden out of the house.

24. During the hearing, Mr. Nidy addressed the court directly and made a number of legal arguments regarding the impact of the Court's past orders and Mr. Thomas' efforts to finance the purchase.

25. Attorney Craig Chambers began representing Ms. Holden two days after the September 15, 2020 hearing.

26. On September 22, 2020, Mr. Chambers filed a "Notice of Allegations of Mr. Greg Nidy Practicing Law Without a License." *See* Ex. 1.

27. The Notice detailed how Mr. Nidy communicated directly with Ms. Holden about legal issues in the matter and discussed the hearings described above. Ms. Holden reported that Mr. Nidy harassed her while she was *pro se* and attempted to damage the relationship between her and Mr. Thomas. *See id.*

28. Mr. Chambers also described in the Notice a September 18, 2020 telephone discussion he had with Mr. Veto in which Mr. Nidy joined the conversation and explained substantive legal issues in the matter. *See id.*

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

29. The unauthorized practice of law includes, but is not limited to, an unlicensed person's actions as a representative in protecting, enforcing or defending the legal rights and duties of another and/or counseling, advising and assisting that person in connection with legal rights and duties. *See People v. Shell*, 148 P.3d 162, 171 (Colo. 2006); and *Denver Bar Assn. v. P.U.C.*, 154 Colo. 273, 279, 391 P.2d 467, 471 (1964).

30. Prohibited activities involve the lay exercise of legal discretion. *People v. Adams*, 243 P.3d 256, 266 (Colo. 2010).

31. Here, Mr. Nidy both exercised legal discretion and acted in a representative capacity during court proceedings and during the telephone conversation with Mr. Chambers on September 18, 2020.

32. Respondent thereby engaged in the unauthorized practice of law.

33. Respondent does not fall within any of the case law or statutory exceptions.

WHEREFORE, the Petitioner prays that this Court issue an order directing Respondent to show cause why Respondent should not be enjoined from engaging in any unauthorized practice of law; thereafter that the Court enjoin Respondent from the practice of law or, in the alternative, that this Court refer this matter to a hearing master for determination of facts and recommendations to the Court on whether Respondent should be enjoined from the unauthorized practice of law. Furthermore, Petitioner does not request restitution, but does move the Court to assess the costs and expenses of these proceedings against Respondent; impose a fine for each incident of unauthorized practice of law, not less than \$250.00 and not more than \$1,000.00; and any other relief deemed appropriate by this Court.

DATED this 11th day of August, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacob M. Vos, #41562

Assistant Regulation Counsel
Attorney for Petitioner

DISTRICT COURT, DENVER COUNTY, COLORADO Address: 1437 Bannock Street Denver, Colorado 80202 Phone: (720) 865-8301	▲ Court Use Only ▲
<i>In re the Parental Responsibilities of Jaylin Thomas</i> Petitioner: JERMAINE THOMAS and Respondent: ASHLIE HOLDEN	
Attorney for Respondent: Craig Franklin Chambers Attorney at Law Craig Franklin Chambers, #28018 7874 W. Friend Dr. Littleton CO 80128 Phone: 303-972-2552 Email: craig@craigchamberslaw.com	Case Number: 2010 DR1851 Division:
NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS OF MR GREG NIDY PRACTICING LAW WITHOUT A LICENSE	

Counsel for Respondent certifies he has conferred with Petitioner’s counsel prior to filing this motion; Petitioner’s counsel did not deny the allegations.

Comes Now, Ashlie Holden, by and through her attorney, Craig Chambers, and respectfully informs the court that, upon information and belief, under the supervision of Attorney Anthony Veto, Mr. Greg Nidy may have been practicing law in this case without a license.

Counsel for Respondent entered an appearance on September 17, 2020. Upon review of the file, it appears Opposing counsel, Anthony Veto, employs a law clerk, Gregory E. Nidy, J.D. Mr. Nidy has signed some of the Petitioner’s court filings as a clerk for Mr Veto.

However, according to Respondent, Mr, Nidy has also performed the functions of an attorney, which include communicating directly with Respondent about legal issues in the case, and without limitation, holding himself out as an attorney.

According to Ms. Holden, Mr Nidy has repeatedly appeared in court representing to the court and to Respondent that he was a lawyer for Petitioner. Upon information and belief,

Nidy has presented evidence and arguments as a lawyer directly to the Judge in this case. According to Respondent, Mr Nidy even gave an attorney registration number to the court before he addressed the Court at court proceedings.

I checked with the Colorado Attorney Registration Counsel: Mr. Greg Nidy does not have a license to practice law in Colorado

On September 18, 2020, I called Mr. Veto about the case. Mr. Nidy jumped in one the conversation and explained substantive issues with regards to the case as would a lawyer. In the same conversation, I asked Mr. Veto about Mr. Nidy's role and qualifications. Specifically, I asked Mr. Veto why Mr. Nidy was acting as an attorney in this case even though he isn't licensed to practice law in Colorado.

Mr. Veto stated Nidy was waiting to take the bar examination and that he was authorized to practice law under the "Student Lawyer Practices Act."

I reviewed C.R.C.P. 205. 7 and C.R.S. 12-5-116.1. I pointed out that Mr. Veto and Mr. Nidy had not submitted the proper certifications for a student or extern lawyer under the Rules. Mr. Veto stated that this was done orally in open court on the case. Mr. Veto stated Mr. Nidy would continue to function as a lawyer in this case and that Veto would supervise his "students" as he saw fit.

I have since learned that Mr. Nidy does not qualify to take the bar examination or to practice as a student lawyer or extern because his "JD" degree was obtained from a Non-ABA accredited law school.

C.R.C. P. 205.7 expressly requires a student lawyer or extern to have completed at least two years of law school at an ABA accredited college. It also requires other certifications not submitted by Mr. Nidy or Mr. Veto. C.R.C.P. 205.7

According to Nidy's resume on social media, attached herein, Nidy got his "JD" degree at William Howard Taft University which, as seen on the internet wiki page, also attached, is not an ABA accredited law school. On the internet, Mr Nidy represents himself as "General Counsel" for the Law Office of Anthony Veto.

The law school Nidy attended, William Howard Taft University, is not accredited by the American Bar Association. The school is not accredited in Colorado, California, or in any other state. Mr. Nidy's law degree was obtained over the internet.

Mr. Nidy has NO legal training from an ABA approved law school and should not be holding himself out as a lawyer or performing and functioning as an attorney in this case.

Mr. Nidy is not authorized to act as a lawyer, hold himself out as a lawyer, present arguments and evidence to the judge as he is not a licensed lawyer in the State of Colorado.

It appears that Mr. Nidy, under the supervision of Mr. Veto, has been practicing law in this case without a license in violation of The Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 5.5.

Respondent reserves the right to challenge any orders in this case under CRCP 60 as this matter is further investigated.

Respectfully Submitted,

September 22, 2020

CRAIG FRANKLIN CHAMBERS, ATTORNEY AT LAW

/s/Craig Franklin Chambers

By _____

Original Signature on File at the Law Office of Craig Franklin Chambers

Craig Franklin Chambers Registration #28018
7874 W. Friend Drive Littleton CO 80128 (303) 972-2552

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 22nd of September, 2020, I served the above document by ICCES electronic filing by me to:

Anthony H. Veto
6595 West 14th Avenue, Suite 204
Lakewood, Co 80214

By:
/s/Craig Franklin Chambers

Craig Franklin Chambers
Original signature on file at law office of Craig Chambers