

REDACTED

District Court, El Paso County, State of Colorado Court Address: P.O. Box 2980 270 South Tejon Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2203 Phone Number: (719)452-5000	DATE FILED: April 14, 2020
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO, Plaintiff, vs. Letecia Stauch, Defendant.	▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲ Case Number: 20CR1358 Div.:15S Ctrm: S403
[D-08] ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR HEARING FOR SANCTIONS	

This matter comes before the Court pursuant to Ms. Stauch’s Motion for Hearing on Sanctions for Violation of Court Order.

According to paragraph 2 of the Motion, Ms. Stauch requests an investigation into a statement made by an individual regarding an alleged crime committed by Ms. Stauch in Kansas. This Court has no jurisdiction over that crime.

According to paragraph 4 of the Motion, Ms. Stauch references “a source” as reporting that Gannon Stauch’s body was found in a suitcase under an overpass. Counsel then asserts in a conclusory fashion that the “source” of this information “had to be one of the listed agencies or parties prohibited from discussing the case pursuant to O-1.” Significantly, there is not yet any evidence in the record regarding the cause of death for Gannon Stauch or how his body was found. As such, it is not even clear whether the facts related are accurate, whether they were made by someone with firsthand information or even law enforcement at all. The news story referenced in the Motion starts out by stating that the details were first reported in a newspaper overseas. The Motion does not identify what newspaper that would have been or the substance of that story. There is also no indication in the Motion regarding when law enforcement in Florida learned that the body found was that of Gannon Stauch or when Florida law enforcement authorities would have become aware of this Court’s O-1 Order. The Court simply declines to take further action at this time based on the conclusory and speculative arguments of defense counsel. If counsel has further facts to share in the form of an affidavit regarding such, the Court may reconsider the matter once such facts are produced.


At paragraph 7 of Ms. Stauch’s Motion, defense counsel alleges that “Through investigation, the defense has learned that the original affidavit listed in the e-filing system was replaced with the redacted version of the affidavit. The redacted version of the affidavit was not sealed, and instead was accessible to the public.” Again, counsel fails to set forth any specific facts in an affidavit

that were revealed through counsel's investigation. This is important as the Court issued Order O-06 unsealing the affidavit at 11:20 a.m. on April 3, 2020. Any changes regarding the replacement or unsealing of the affidavit of probable cause after that point in time would have occurred as a result of this Court's Order.

Defendant did not file any supporting affidavits setting forth any specific facts regarding conduct attributable to the District Attorney's Office or any other parties that are the subject of the O-1 Order. Defense counsel is free to continue its investigation but based on this meager record, the Court declines to take further action at this time. As such, Defendant Stauch's Motion for Hearing on Sanctions for Violation of Court Order is DENIED.

SO ORDERED this 14th day of April, 2020.

BY THE COURT:



Gregory R. Werner
District Court Judge