

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 Refer to Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished decisions.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

No. A-1-CA-38835

TADEUSZ NIEMYJSKI,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

**DAVID HERNANDEZ and
LOVELACE HEALTH SYSTEM, INC.,**

Defendants-Appellees.

**APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BERNALILLO COUNTY
Nancy J. Franchini, District Judge**

Tadeusz Niemyjski
Albuquerque, NM

Pro Se Appellant

Rodey, Dickason, Sloan, Akin & Robb P.A.
Jocelyn C. Drennan
R. Nelson Franse
Albuquerque, NM

for Appellees

MEMORANDUM OPINION

ATTREP, Judge.

{1} Plaintiff appeals from the district court's order granting Defendants' motion for dismissal with prejudice as a sanction for Plaintiff's vexatious conduct [1 RP 187-209] and dismissing Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice [2 RP 261-62]. This Court issued a calendar notice proposing to affirm because we were unable to discern the relief Plaintiff sought and grounds on which that requested relief was based, given a lack of clarity in Plaintiff's docketing statement and Plaintiff's failure to adequately develop or identify what his arguments on appeal may be.

{2} Plaintiff has filed a memorandum in opposition to this Court's notice of proposed disposition. However, Plaintiff has not provided this Court with any authority or argument to establish that the district court's dismissal of his complaint with prejudice was in error. See *In re Adoption of Doe*, 1984-NMSC-024, ¶ 2, 100 N.M. 764, 676 P.2d 1329 ("We have long held that to present an issue on appeal for review, an appellant must submit argument *and authority* as required by rule. . . . Issues raised in appellate briefs which are unsupported by cited authority will not be reviewed by us on appeal." (citations omitted)); *Corona v. Corona*, 2014-NMCA-071, ¶ 28, 329 P.3d 701 ("This Court has no duty to review an argument that is not adequately developed."). Moreover, to the extent Plaintiff contends that the district court judge combined two hearings improperly, hearing Defendants' motion prior to Plaintiff's motion; that Defendants presented to the judge "some document which [Plaintiff] never got to see" [MIO 3]; that the district court judge's conduct was "rude" and "verbally abusing and totally disrespectful"; and that the district court "violate[d] [Plaintiff's] civil constitutional right and most importa[n]t due process," [MIO 2] Plaintiff has not indicated on what bases these assertions arose or whether these claims of error were preserved, and has not otherwise developed these arguments. See *Elane Photography, LLC v. Willock*, 2013-NMSC-040, ¶ 70, 309 P.3d 53 ("We will not review unclear arguments, or guess at what a party's arguments might be." (alteration, internal quotation marks, and citation omitted)).

{3} Accordingly, we affirm.

{4} IT IS SO ORDERED.

JENNIFER L. ATTREP, Judge

WE CONCUR:

MEGAN P. DUFFY, Judge

JANE B. YOHALEM, Judge