

- Mr. Meehan requested that Mr. M meet him at the Bagel Deli and Restaurant, 6439 E. Hampden Avenue, Denver, Colorado. The meeting occurred at 2:00 pm, on 4/26/16. Mr. Meehan was casually dressed and “was drinking a beer,” when Mr. M arrived, which Mr. M regarded as “unprofessional.”
- Throughout both interviews, Mr. M told me he did not want to be involved in this investigation because he “doesn’t want to help [Ms. N].” He was adamant that his cooperation “will help [Ms. N] in some way.”
- He also told me that he was afraid that Mr. Meehan would contact him and he wanted no further contact with Mr. Meehan. He was also concerned that this investigation might assist Ms. N in getting Mr. Meehan’s evaluations “thrown out” and he will “have to pay for another PRE” when he was “still paying his attorney’s fees.”
- Mr. M told me that the he and Ms. N settled out of court and that they have a 50-50 parenting plan.

Interview with Ms. N

On 11/22/16, I interviewed Ms. N by phone. She told me the following, in part.

- Ms. N reiterated the information in her complaint, but did not have any new information to report.
- Ms. N told me that she settled out of court with Mr. M, but felt it was an unfavorable settlement which was based on information in Mr. Meehan’s PREU report.

On 11/28/16, I left a voicemail for Ms. N, asking her if she had signed the DORA mandatory disclosure form. On 11/29/16, she sent an email stating, “I don’t believe Mr. Meehan ever had me sign something like that.” She said her attorney told her about DORA and she “did some research” before filing her complaint.

Interviews with Todd Burnham and Gavin Halligan, The Burnham Law Firm (Burnham Law)

On 11/22/16 and 11/23/16, I interviewed Ms. N’s attorneys, Todd Burnham and Gavin Halligan. They told me the following, in part.

- On 11/22/16, regarding the Disclosure for the court, Ms. Halligan told me that Mr. Meehan “didn’t serve either of us” so they were unable “to object in a timely manner.”
- She said they only learned of the Disclosure when their paralegal was reviewing the ICCES database to ensure that the Burnham Law files were complete.
- Ms. Halligan told me that when Mr. Burnham read the Disclosure, he said, “That’s not true.”
- Mr. Burnham told me that “The facts don’t support” Mr. Meehan’s statements on the disclosure. He confirmed his representation of Mr. Meehan in the cases I found in the Colorado Courts database. He also told me that he also represented Mr. Meehan in response to a complaint filed with DORA in 2013 [case number 2013-3298].
- On 02/11/15, Mr. Burnham withdrew his representation for Mr. Meehan in his dissolution of marriage matter. Please note that this means that Mr. Meehan was still represented by Mr. Burnham at the time of his appointment for the PRE and when he filed his Disclosure with the court.
- He also confirmed that Mr. Meehan did not serve him and that his paralegal had only discovered the disclosure during an ICCES review of Ms. N’s case.

Attempted Interview with Mr. Meehan

Although I left multiple voicemail messages and sent two emails requesting that he call me and provide a specific statement regarding the 56 day delay in notifying Ms. N’s attorneys of the conflict of