

Colorado Supreme Court 2 East 14th Avenue Denver, CO 80203	DATE FILED: June 11, 2018 CASE NUMBER: 2018SA76
Original Proceeding in Discipline, 2017UPL39 and 2017UPL44	
<b>Petitioner:</b>  The People of the State of Colorado,  v.  <b>Respondents:</b>  Sebastian Corchado; Maria Acosta; and Latinos Unidos Multiservices, Inc., a Colorado corporation.	Supreme Court Case No: 2018SA76
ORDER OF COURT	

Upon consideration of the Petition for Injunction, the Order and Rule to Show Cause and the Stipulation, Agreement and Affidavit Containing Respondents' Conditional Admission of Unauthorized Practice of Law filed in the above cause, and now being sufficiently advised in the premises,

IT IS ORDERED that said Respondents shall be, and the same hereby are, ENJOINED from engaging in the unauthorized practice of law in the State of Colorado.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents jointly and severally pay restitution as described in paragraph 6 of the Stipulation, Agreement and Affidavit Containing Respondents' Conditional Admission of Unauthorized Practice of Law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents are assessed costs in the amount of \$224.00. Said costs to be paid to the Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel within thirty (30) days of the date of this order.

BY THE COURT, JUNE 11, 2018.

SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO  
2 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Denver, Colorado 80203

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING IN UNAUTHORIZED  
PRACTICE OF LAW, 17UPL39 and 17UPL44

Petitioner:  
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Respondents:  
SEBASTIAN CORCHADO, MARIA ACOSTA and  
LATINOS UNIDOS MULTISERVICES, INC., a  
Colorado corporation

Kim E. Ikeler, #15590  
Assistant Regulation Counsel  
Attorney for Petitioner  
1300 Broadway, Suite 500  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
Telephone: (303) 928-7907  
E-mail: [k.ikeler@csc.state.co.us](mailto:k.ikeler@csc.state.co.us)

Sebastian Corchado, *pro se*, individually and as  
President of Latinos Unidos Multiservices, Inc.  
1423 Havana St.  
Aurora, Colorado 80012  
Telephone: 720-291-2062  
E-mail: [latinosscc@gmail.com](mailto:latinosscc@gmail.com)

Richard Anthony Lucero, # 9829  
Attorney for Respondent Maria Acosta  
3030 W. 38<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Denver, Colorado 80211  
Telephone: (303) 455-7699  
E-mail: [ralucero@luceroandassoc.com](mailto:ralucero@luceroandassoc.com)

▲ COURT USE  
ONLY ▲

Case Number: 18SA76

**STIPULATION, AGREEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT CONTAINING  
RESPONDENTS' CONDITIONAL ADMISSION OF UNAUTHORIZED  
PRACTICE OF LAW**

On this 22 day of May 2018, Kim E. Ikeler, Assistant Regulation Counsel and attorney for the Petitioner, Respondent Sebastian Corchado, *pro se*, individually and as President and co-owner of Latinos Unidos Multiservices, Inc., and Respondent Maria Acosta, individually and as co-owner of Latinos Unidos Multiservices, Inc., who is represented in this case by Richard Anthony Lucero, Esq., enter into the following Stipulation, Agreement, and Affidavit Containing Respondents' Conditional Admission of Unauthorized Practice of Law ("Stipulation") and submit the same to the Supreme Court for its consideration.

**RECOMMENDATION: Entry of an Order of Injunction, enjoining Respondents from further unauthorized practice of law, requiring the payment of restitution, and assessing costs, as discussed below.**

1. Sebastian Corchado is not licensed as an attorney in the State of Colorado. Respondent Corchado is not otherwise authorized by federal or state law to engage in any practice of law. Maria Acosta is not licensed as an attorney in the State of Colorado. Respondent Acosta is not otherwise authorized by federal or state law to engage in any practice of law. Respondent Latinos Unidos Multiservices, Inc. does not employ any licensed lawyers.

2. The Colorado Supreme Court has exclusive jurisdiction to determine

what constitutes the unauthorized practice of law in Colorado. 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 (Colo. 2006); and *Denver Bar Assn. v. P.U.C.*, 154 Colo. 273, 391 P.2d 467 (1964). In addition, preparation of legal documents for others by an unlicensed person, other than solely as a typist, is the unauthorized practice of law, unless the Colorado Supreme Court has authorized such action in a specific circumstance. *Title Guaranty v. Denver Bar Ass'n*, 135 Colo. 423, 312 P.2d 1011 (1957).

3. Respondents understand that these restrictions exist, regardless of whether a fee is accepted for the services rendered and even if Respondents disclose that they are not Colorado attorneys.

4. Respondents Corchado and Acosta engaged in the unauthorized practice of law as follows. Respondents gave legal advice to Ms. Parroquin Martinez and Ms. Huerta Parroquin about their removal cases and about immigration relief, including asylum and work authorization, for them and their children. Although Respondents nominally associated at the time with attorney Nathan Vanderhoofven, he was not able to advise these clients because they speak Spanish and he is an English-only speaker. Respondents selected and prepared

immigration forms for these clients, albeit some of those forms were later signed by attorney Vanderhoofven.

Respondents Corchado and Acosta also engaged in the unauthorized practice of law by selecting and preparing Form I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (“DACA”), for Eduardo Navarro Payan and Lesley Salazar.

Respondent Latinos Unidos Multiservices, Inc. engaged in the unauthorized practice of law through the acts of its officers and agents, Sebastian Corchado and Maria Acosta.

5. Respondents understand 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", legal consultant, legal advocate, independent paralegal, or as a person or business capable of providing direct legal services to consumers, 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. 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;

h. conducting the business of management of a law practice to the extent that the exercise of legal judgment on behalf of another occurs; and

i. soliciting or accepting any fees for legal services.

6. As part of and as a result of their unauthorized practice of law, Respondents collected \$1,510 from Teresa Parroquin Martinez and \$1,955 from Areli Huerta Parroquin to which they were not entitled. Pursuant to C.R.C.P. 237(a), those fees should be refunded. Respondents will fully refund upon the Supreme Court's issuance of an Order of Injunction the fees they collected from

Ms. Parroquin Martinez and Ms. Huerta Parroquin. Respondents will further pay these clients interest at the statutory rate of 8% from the date collected until the date paid. The total amount with interest due to Ms. Parroquin Martinez is \$1,804.85 plus \$.40 *per diem* accruing from December 1, 2017 until paid. The total amount with interest due to Ms. Huerta Parroquin is \$2,316.47 plus \$.52 *per diem* accruing from December 1, 2017 until paid. Respondents will refund these amounts by sending certified checks or money orders, payable to Ms. Parroquin Martinez and Huerta Parroquin, respectively, for the full refund, to Christina Brown, Esq., The Law Office of Christina Brown, 1888 Sherman St., Ste. 200, Denver, CO 80203.

Respondents also will refund to Eduardo Navarro Payan \$340, plus interest of \$92.39, accruing at \$.09 *per diem* from January 1, 2018 until paid. Respondents will refund this amount by sending a certified check or money order to Mr. Navarro Payan at 3666 S. Acoma St., Apt. 202, Englewood, CO 80110.

Respondents will further refund to Lesley Salazar \$175, plus interest of \$46.86, accruing at \$.05 *per diem* from January 1, 2018 until paid. Respondents will refund this amount by sending a certified check or money order to Ms. Salazar at 1211 Joliet St., Aurora, CO 80010.

Respondents also will contemporaneously provide to the Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel, attention to Assistant Regulation Counsel Kim E. Ikeler,

copies of Respondent's letters transmitting the refunds and copies of the cashier's checks or money orders by which the refunds are made. The Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel may contact attorney Brown, Mr. Navarro Payan and Ms. Salazar and confirm their receipt of the full refund plus interest from Respondent.

7. Respondents will pay costs in the sum of \$224 incurred in conjunction with this matter, made payable to Colorado Supreme Court Attorney Regulation Offices. Statutory interest shall accrue should payment not be made in timely fashion.

8. Respondents are familiar with the rules of the Colorado Supreme Court regarding the procedure for prosecution of the unauthorized practice of law and with the rights provided by those rules. Respondents acknowledge the right to a full and complete evidentiary hearing on the charges in the Petition for Injunction. At any such hearing, Respondents would have the right to be represented by counsel, present evidence, call witnesses, and cross-examine the witnesses presented by Petitioner. At any such formal hearing, Petitioner would have the burden of proof and would be required to prove the charges contained in the Petition by a preponderance of the evidence. Nonetheless, having full knowledge of the right to such a formal hearing, Respondents waive that right.

9. Respondents 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 Respondents' personal decision, and Respondents affirm there has been no coercion or other intimidating acts by any person or agency concerning this matter.

10. This Stipulation is premised and conditioned upon acceptance of the same by the Supreme Court. If for any reason the Stipulation is not accepted without changes or modification, then the admissions, confessions, and stipulations made by Respondents will be of no effect. Either party will have the opportunity to accept or reject any modification. If either party rejects the modification, then the parties shall be entitled to a full evidentiary hearing; and no confession, stipulation, or other statement made by Respondents in conjunction with this offer may be subsequently used. If the Stipulation is rejected, then the matter will be heard and considered pursuant to C.R.C.P. 235.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR AND CONSENT TO INJUNCTION AND  
ORDER FOR RESTITUTION AND COSTS**

Based on the foregoing, the parties hereto ask the Supreme Court to enjoin Respondents from further unauthorized practice of law, to order Respondents, jointly and severally, to pay restitution, as described in paragraph 6 above, and to assess Respondents costs of \$224.

Respondent Sebastian Corchado, *pro se*, individually and as President and co-owner of Respondent Latinos Unidos Multiservices, Inc., Respondent Maria Acosta, individually and as co-owner of Latinos Unidos Multiservices, Inc., who is



