

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 Refer to Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished decisions.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-39616

**FRANCISCO VALENZUELA
and RACHEL VALENZUELA,**

Petitioners-Appellees,

v.

**ALLAN D. SNYDER
and SHERRY L. SNYDER,**

Respondents-Appellants.

**APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF ROOSEVELT COUNTY
David P. Reeb, District Judge**

Eric D. Dixon
Portales, NM

for Appellees

Allan D. Snyder
Sherry L. Snyder
Greeley, CO

Pro Se Appellants

MEMORANDUM OPINION

IVES, Judge.

{1} Respondents appeal from the district court's judgment enforcing a prior decision letter, and thus ordering Respondents to pay Petitioners \$4,500 in attorney fees as a sanction. We entered a notice of proposed summary disposition, proposing to affirm. Respondents filed a memorandum in opposition to that notice, which we have duly considered. Unpersuaded, we affirm.

{2} Respondents argue that this case and prior related actions are frivolous, and thus the district court lacked any authority to decide them. [MIO 1-3] Respondents, however, have not cited any authority not already considered by this Court, have not cited any portion of the record suggesting our understanding of the relevant facts is incorrect, and have not otherwise convinced us that our initial proposed disposition on the issue before us is erroneous. See *Hennessey v. Duryea*, 1998-NMCA-036, ¶ 24, 124 N.M. 754, 955 P.2d 683 (“Our courts have repeatedly held that, in summary calendar cases, the burden is on the party opposing the proposed disposition to clearly point out errors in fact or law.”); see also *State v. Aragon*, 1999-NMCA-060, ¶ 10, 127 N.M. 393, 981 P.2d 1211 (stating that there is a presumption of correctness in the rulings or decisions of the district court, and the party claiming error bears the burden of showing such error). Therefore, for the reasons stated in our notice of proposed disposition [CN 4-5], we conclude that Respondents have not demonstrated that the district court abused its discretion in ordering the attorney fees as a sanction against Respondents. We affirm.

{3} IT IS SO ORDERED.

ZACHARY A. IVES, Judge

WE CONCUR:

JENNIFER L. ATTREP, Judge

SHAMMARA H. HENDERSON, Judge