

This decision of the New Mexico Court of Appeals was not selected for publication in the New Mexico Appellate Reports. Refer to Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished decisions. Electronic decisions may contain computer-generated errors or other deviations from the official version filed by the Court of Appeals.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

RAUL A. CANO C.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

No. A-1-CA-37848

JEFFREY PETERSON,

Defendant-Appellee.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BERNALILLO COUNTY

Carl J. Butkus, District Judge

Raul A. Cano C.
Albuquerque, NM

Pro Se Appellant

Allen Law Firm, LLC
Michelle Maire Lalley Blake
Albuquerque, NM

for Appellee

MEMORANDUM OPINION

VANZI, Judge.

{1} Plaintiff, a self-represented litigant, appeals the district court's affirmance of the metropolitan court's order of dismissal. This Court issued a notice of proposed disposition, proposing to affirm. Plaintiff filed a memorandum in opposition, which we have duly considered. Unpersuaded, we affirm.

{2} On appeal, Plaintiff contends that the trial court erred by refusing to admit two documents (a repair order and NADA car values) under exceptions to the hearsay rule. [DS 2] Our notice proposed to adopt the district court's recitation of the facts, the applicable law, and its reasoning and result.

{3} In response, Plaintiff has not asserted any new facts, law, or argument. He simply “ask[s] to be rewarded more money from this matter [and contends] the law was not applied in the correct way.” [MIO 1] This does not persuade us that our adoption of the district court’s memorandum opinion, as laid out in our calendar notice, is incorrect. See *State v. Mondragon*, 1988-NMCA-027, ¶ 10, 107 N.M. 421, 759 P.2d 1003 (stating that a party responding to a summary calendar notice must come forward and specifically point out errors of law and fact, and the repetition of earlier arguments does not fulfill this requirement), *superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in State v. Harris*, 2013-NMCA-031, ¶ 3, 297 P.3d 374.

{4} Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in our notice, we affirm.

{5} IT IS SO ORDERED.

LINDA M. VANZI, Judge

WE CONCUR:

JULIE J. VARGAS, Judge

JENNIFER L. ATTREP, Judge