

*People v. Thomas Allan Dill. 25PDJ14. November 4, 2025.*

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge approved the parties' stipulation to discipline and publicly censure Thomas Allan Dill (attorney registration number 34301), with conditions. The public censure took effect November 4, 2025.

Dill acted in a general counsel capacity to assist a company owner with an employee's wage and hour case. The Colorado Department of Labor ("DOL") determined that the company owed the worker wages and penalties of more than \$21,000.00. The DOL also assessed the company \$4,850.00 in fines. The sums were due on May 3, 2022. On that date, another lawyer assisting the company asked for an extension of time to pay and noted the company was sending \$3,000.00 that same day as a good faith act. But the company never sent the \$3,000.00, and the employee did not agree to the extension of time to pay.

In July 2022, the employee requested that the Gunnison County Court record the DOL's decision and make it a judgment of the court. The court did so and issued a writ of garnishment—judgment debtor. In August 2022, at the employee's request, the court released the garnished funds to the Gunnison County Court clerk. On the company's behalf, Dill swiftly filed an answer to the writ of garnishment, objecting to the release of funds. In that filing, Dill represented that the company had made an initial payment "with a proposed payment plan." Dill also stated that the company claimed a setoff based on the initial payment, and he requested that the court decline to release the funds until it had determined that setoff amount. Dill never verified the accuracy of these assertions, and he did not produce any documentation to the court substantiating them.

The employee moved to compel and sought a subpoena for the company's bank records, and the court ordered the company to produce the documents. Instead of producing the documents, Dill withdrew the company's objection to the release of funds, effectively waiving his client's right to a hearing on the validity of the writ of garnishment. In that filing, Dill represented that the company had pursued settlement of the judgment in good faith and that the company had requested an extension of time, to which the employee had not objected. This statement was inaccurate.

The employee sought attorney's fees and costs. The court eventually awarded the employee \$35,000.00 in attorney's fees and \$910.10 in costs, assessed jointly and severally against Dill and the company. The court concluded that Dill never provided any proof of a payment plan or proof of a \$3,000.00 payment.

Through the conduct described above, Dill violated Colo. RPC 8.4(c) (providing that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation) and Colo. RPC 8.4(d) (providing that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct prejudicing the administration of justice).

The case file is public per C.R.C.P. 242.41(a).