

A law is unconstitutional only if it "is vague, not in the sense that it requires a person to conform his conduct to an imprecise but comprehensible normative standard, but rather in the sense that no standard of conduct is specified at all." Bd. of Educ. of Jefferson Cty. Sch. Dist. R-1 v. Wilder, 960 P.2d 695, 703 (Colo. 1998) (quoting [Coates v. City of Cincinnati, 402 U.S. 611, 614, 91 S.Ct. 1686, 29 L.Ed.2d 214 \(1971\)](#)).

Overall, "[t]he vagueness doctrine is not an exercise in semantics to emasculate legislation; rather, it is a pragmatic means to ensure fairness. Where fairness can be achieved by a commonsense reading ... we will not adopt a hypertechnical construction to invalidate the provision." Ams. [United for Separation of Church & State Fund, Inc. v. State, 648 P.2d 1072, 1086 \(Colo. 1982\)](#) (quoting [People v. Garcia, 197 Colo. 550, 595 P.2d 228, 231 \(1979\)](#)).

From: *ROCKY MOUNTAIN RETAIL v. City of Northglenn*, 393 P. 3d 533 - Colo: Supreme Court 2017

Also:

TEST OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL VAGUENESS. A statute which either requires or forbids an act in terms so vague that men of common intelligence must guess at its meaning and differ as to its application violates the first essential of due process of law. *Memorial Trusts, Inc. v. Beery*, 144 Colo. 448, 356 P.2d 884 (1960)

The controlling principle in a void for vagueness challenge is whether the questioned law either forbids or requires the doing of an act in terms so vague that men of ordinary intelligence must necessarily guess as to its meaning and differ as to its application. *People ex rel. City of Arvada v. Nissen*, 650 P.2d 547 (Colo. 1982)