

Chapter 44

Miscellaneous Civil Law Matters

Article 1

Habeas Corpus

§ 44-1-1. [Who may obtain writ.]

Every person imprisoned or otherwise restrained of his liberty, except in the cases in the following section specified, may prosecute a writ of habeas corpus, according to the provisions of this chapter, to obtain relief from such imprisonment or restraint, if it proves to be unlawful.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 1; C.L. 1884, § 2012; C.L. 1897, § 2781; Code 1915, § 2589; C.S. 1929, § 63-101; 1941 Comp., § 25-1101; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-1.

- I. General Consideration.
- II. Jurisdiction Of Court.
- III. Custody Of Child.

- I. General Consideration.

Cross-references. - For constitutional provisions relating to habeas corpus, see N.M. Const., art. II, § 7 and N.M. Const., art. VI, §§ 3, 13. As to when the petitioner will be discharged, see 44-1-15 NMSA 1978. As to causes for discharge of petitioner in custody under civil process, see 44-1-17 NMSA 1978. As to release on bail, see 44-1-19, 44-1-23, 44-1-24 NMSA 1978. As to the necessity, before applying for a writ of habeas corpus, of exhausting post-conviction motion remedies attacking sentence, see 31-11-6 NMSA 1978 and Rule 5-802B SCRA 1986. As to mentally ill or deficient patients retaining the right to habeas corpus after commitment, see 43-1-12, 43-1-13 and 43-1-16 NMSA 1978.

Meaning of "this chapter". - The term "this chapter" appeared in the original act, which was divided into three unnumbered divisions, to-wit: habeas corpus, §§ 1 to 36; mandamus, §§ 37 to 50; prohibition, §§ 51 to 56; and apparently referred to §§ 1 to 36, the operative provisions of which are compiled as 44-1-1 to 44-1-22, 44-1-25 to 44-1-37 NMSA 1978.

Proceeding in habeas corpus is in restricted sense a civil proceeding. *Burch v. Roberson*, 17 N.M. 405, 132 P. 1137 (1913).

Habeas corpus is not a special statutory proceeding. *In re Forest*, 45 N.M. 204, 113 P.2d 582 (1941).

Must apply to district court before proceeding in supreme court. - Where although no direct appeal is taken from the judgments of conviction which are now attacked, the prisoner has the right under New Mexico law to bring habeas corpus in the state courts, and he must apply to a district court for habeas corpus before an original proceeding may be brought in the New Mexico supreme court. *Cox v. Raburn*, 314 F.2d 856 (10th Cir.), cert. denied, 374 U.S. 853, 83 S. Ct. 1920, 10 L. Ed. 2d 1074 (1963).

Denial of petition for habeas corpus by district court not appealable. *State v. Clark*, 83 N.M. 484, 493 P.2d 969 (Ct. App. 1971), cert. denied, 83 N.M. 473, 493 P.2d 958 (1972).

No constitutional right to transcript. - Absent a showing of special circumstances, defendant had no federal constitutional right to a copy of the transcript for use in preparation of a motion for post-conviction relief or a petition for habeas corpus. *State v. Toussaint*, 84 N.M. 677, 506 P.2d 1224 (Ct. App. 1973).

State remedies not exhausted when grounds not presented to state. - When grounds urged for federal habeas corpus relief may be but are not presented to a state court, the state remedies have not been exhausted. Where the state district court habeas corpus is dismissed by counsel for the prisoner with the knowledge and acquiescence of the prisoner, the subsequent denials of original proceedings in the state supreme court conformed with the state practice and do not detract from the availability of a state court remedy. *Cox v. Raburn*, 314 F.2d 856 (10th Cir.), cert. denied, 374 U.S. 853, 83 S. Ct. 1920, 10 L. Ed. 2d 1074 (1963).

Petition from juvenile court need not be presented to district. - To require presentation of a petition for habeas corpus in the first instance, in a juvenile court case, to the district judge would be a vain and useless prerequisite. *Peyton v. Nord*, 78 N.M. 717, 437 P.2d 716 (1968).

Cumulative doctrine has no merit in habeas corpus proceeding, particularly when each of the claimed points has been specifically ruled upon by the highest court of the jurisdiction and is found to be without merit. *Nelson v. Cox*, 66 N.M. 397, 349 P.2d 118 (1960).

In habeas corpus proceedings, movant has burden of showing that he is entitled to the writ and the writ should be denied where the allegations are insufficient. *Roberts v. Staples*, 79 N.M. 298, 442 P.2d 788 (1968).

Burden to prove testimony false and used to procure conviction. - In habeas corpus proceedings the burden is on the petitioner to prove not only that the testimony admitted was false but that it was knowingly, willfully and intentionally used by the prosecution to procure the conviction. *Johnson v. Cox*, 72 N.M. 55, 380 P.2d 199, cert. denied, 375 U.S. 855, 84 S. Ct. 117, 11 L. Ed. 2d 82 (1963).

With confessions court looks only to behavior of police officers. - In determining whether there has been a denial of due process by the admission into evidence of a confession alleged to have been involuntarily obtained, the court is not concerned with the motive of the petitioner in confession or whether the signed confession contained the truth, but only with whether the behavior of the law enforcement officers was such as to overbear petitioner's will to resist and bring about a confession not freely determined. *Johnson v. Cox*, 72 N.M. 55, 380 P.2d 199, cert. denied, 375 U.S. 855, 84 S. Ct. 117, 11 L. Ed. 2d 82 (1963).

Habeas corpus does not lie where guilty plea made intelligently. - Habeas corpus relief did not lie on claim that guilty plea was not intelligently made where record showed that defendant answered both by himself and through an interpreter to questions put by the judge to be sure that defendant knew what he was doing when he pleaded guilty. *Orosco v. Cox*, 359 F.2d 764 (10th Cir. 1966).

No relief where absence of attorney causes no prejudice. - Habeas corpus relief was refused where defendant was not furnished counsel at a preliminary hearing nor upon arraignment where he pleaded not guilty to an indictment, since no prejudice was shown where defendant did not testify at the preliminary hearing, and no contention is made that any incriminating statements were made then or upon his arraignment. *Gallegos v. Cox*, 341 F.2d 107 (10th Cir.), cert. denied, 381 U.S. 918, 85 S. Ct. 1548, 14 L. Ed. 2d 438 (1965).

No relief where no ground for collateral attack occurred. - Where the record fails to establish any prejudice resulting from anything which happened at the preliminary hearing, where defendant was without representation by counsel, and since upon the defendant's arraignment before the state district court counsel was appointed for him and he pleaded guilty, and no question is raised as to the voluntary nature of that plea or as to the competence of counsel, in the circumstances nothing which occurred at the preliminary hearing is any ground for collateral attack, and the trial court acted properly in dismissing the petition without a hearing. *Downing v. New Mexico State Supreme Court*, 339 F.2d 435 (10th Cir. 1964).

Law reviews. - For note, "Post-Conviction Relief After Release From Custody: A Federal Message and a New Mexico Remedy," see 9 Nat. Resources J. 85 (1969).

For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

For article, "Separation of Powers and the Judicial Rule-Making Power in New Mexico: The Need for Prudential Restraints," see 15 N.M.L. Rev. 407 (1985).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 117.
Right of one detained pursuant to quarantine to habeas corpus, 2 A.L.R. 1542.
Loss of jurisdiction by delay in imposing sentence, 3 A.L.R. 1003.
Right of state or public officer to appeal from an order in habeas corpus releasing one from custody, 10 A.L.R. 385; 30 A.L.R. 1322.
Habeas corpus to test constitutionality of ordinance under which petitioner is held, 32 A.L.R. 1054.
Right to discharge on ground that prosecution was barred by limitations, where defendant had pleaded guilty after statute had run, 37 A.L.R. 1116.
Habeas corpus in case of sentence which is excessive because imposing both fine and imprisonment, 49 A.L.R. 494.
Right to prove absence from demanding state or alibi on habeas corpus in extradition proceedings, 51 A.L.R. 797.
Power to grant writ of habeas corpus pending appeal from conviction, 52 A.L.R. 876.
Habeas corpus as remedy for exclusion of eligible class or classes of persons from jury list, 52 A.L.R. 927.
Habeas corpus to test the sufficiency of indictment or information as regards the offense sought to be charged, 57 A.L.R. 85.
Habeas corpus as remedy for delay in bringing accused to trial or to retrial after reversal, 58 A.L.R. 1512.
Arresting one who has been discharged on habeas corpus or released on bail, 62 A.L.R. 462.
Illegal or erroneous sentence as ground for habeas corpus, 76 A.L.R. 468.
Bar of limitations as proper subject of investigation in extradition proceedings or in habeas corpus proceedings for release of one sought to be extradited, 77 A.L.R. 902.
Determination in extradition proceedings, or on habeas corpus in such proceedings, whether a crime is charged, 81 A.L.R. 552; 40 A.L.R.2d 1151.
Pending suit for annulment, divorce or separation as affecting remedy by habeas corpus for custody of child, 82 A.L.R. 1146.
Motive or ulterior purpose of officials demanding or granting extradition as proper subject of inquiry on habeas corpus, 94 A.L.R. 1496.
Discharge on habeas corpus after conviction as affecting claim or plea of former jeopardy, 97 A.L.R. 160.
Jurisdiction of court in divorce suit to award custody of child as affected by orders in, or pendency of, proceedings in habeas corpus for custody of child, 110 A.L.R. 745.
Habeas corpus as remedy in case of insanity of one convicted of crime, 121 A.L.R. 270.
Disqualification of judge who presided at trial or of juror as ground of habeas corpus, 124 A.L.R. 1079.
Failure to examine witnesses to determine degree of guilt before pronouncing sentence upon plea of guilty as ground for habeas corpus, 134 A.L.R. 968.
Change of judicial decision as ground of habeas corpus for release of one held upon previous adjudication or conviction of contempt, 136 A.L.R. 1032.
Mistreatment of prisoner lawfully in custody as ground for habeas corpus, 155 A.L.R. 145.
Defective title to office of judge, prosecuting attorney, or other officer participating at petitioner's trial or confinement as ground for habeas corpus, 158 A.L.R. 529.

Denial of relief to prisoner on habeas corpus as bar to second application, 161 A.L.R. 1331.

Right to aid of counsel in application or hearing for habeas corpus, 162 A.L.R. 922.

Right to try one brought within jurisdiction legally or as a result of mistake as to identity, 165 A.L.R. 947.

Invalidity of prior condition or sentence as ground for habeas corpus where one is sentenced as second offender, 171 A.L.R. 541.

Jurisdiction of habeas corpus proceedings for custody of child having legal domicile in other states, 4 A.L.R.2d 7.

Former jeopardy as ground for habeas corpus, 8 A.L.R.2d 285.

Habeas corpus on ground of deprivation of right to appeal, 9 A.L.R.2d 789.

Habeas corpus to review commitment for contempt for failure to obey court order or decree either beyond power or jurisdiction of court or merely erroneous, 12 A.L.R.2d 1059.

Nonresidence as affecting one's right to custody of child in habeas corpus proceedings, 15 A.L.R.2d 432.

Existence of other remedy as affecting habeas corpus on ground of restoration of sanity of one confined as an incompetent other than in connection with crime, 21 A.L.R.2d 1004.

Habeas corpus on ground of restoration to sanity of one confined as an incompetent other than in connection with crime, 21 A.L.R.2d 1004.

Habeas corpus to test validity of confinement under statutes relating to sexual psychopaths, 24 A.L.R.2d 376.

Insanity of accused at time of commission of offense (not raised at trial) as ground for habeas corpus after conviction, 29 A.L.R.2d 703.

Waiver or loss of accused's right to speedy trial as affecting right to habeas corpus, 57 A.L.R.2d 339.

Who, other than natural or adopting parents, or heirs of latter, may bring habeas corpus attacking adoption decree, 92 A.L.R.2d 825.

Right of prisoner held under extradition warrant to raise question of identity in habeas corpus proceeding, 93 A.L.R.2d 916.

Proceedings to obtain custody of illegitimate child, 98 A.L.R.2d 421.

Attack, by petition for writ of habeas corpus, on personal service as having been obtained by fraud or trickery, 98 A.L.R.2d 600.

Child custody provisions of divorce or separation decree as subject to modification on habeas corpus, 4 A.L.R.3d 1277.

Habeas corpus as remedy for infringement of right of accused to communicate with attorney, 5 A.L.R.3d 1360.

Support of child, power of court in habeas corpus proceedings relating to custody of child to adjudicate amount which shall be paid for, or to modify agreement in that regard, 17 A.L.R.3d 764.

Suppression of evidence by prosecution in criminal case as ground for habeas corpus, 34 A.L.R.3d 1244.

Modern status of rule relating to jurisdiction of state court to try criminal defendant brought within jurisdiction illegally or as result of fraud or mistake, 25 A.L.R.4th 157.

When is a person in custody of governmental authorities for purpose of exercise of state

remedy of habeas corpus - modern cases, 26 A.L.R.4th 455.

Relief available for violation of right to counsel at sentencing, 65 A.L.R.4th 183.

Abuse of writ as basis for dismissal of state prisoner's second or successive petition for federal habeas corpus, 60 A.L.R. Fed. 481.

Effect of escape from state custody on petitioner's rights in federal habeas corpus proceedings, 61 A.L.R. Fed. 938.

Availability of postconviction relief under 28 U.S.C.S. § 2254 based on alleged governmental violation of Interstate Agreement on Detainers Act (18 U.S.C.S. Appx), 63 A.L.R. Fed. 155.

Review by federal civil courts of court-martial convictions, 95 A.L.R. Fed. 472.

39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 163.

II. Jurisdiction Of Court.

Writ available only when lower court exceeds jurisdiction. - A writ of habeas corpus is available only when the lower court has exceeded its jurisdiction and cannot take the place of a writ of error or an appeal, however irregular or erroneous the judgment may be. *Notestine v. Rogers*, 18 N.M. 462, 138 P. 207 (1914); *In re Cica*, 18 N.M. 452, 137 P. 598 (1913); *In re Canavan*, 17 N.M. 100, 130 P. 248 (1912); *In re Peraltareavis*, 8 N.M. 27, 41 P. 538 (1895), appeal dismissed, 18 S. Ct. 945, 42 L. Ed. 1207 (1897).

Deficiency in indictment not grounds for review. - In habeas corpus proceeding the information or indictment under which a petitioner was sentenced is not open to review on grounds of deficiencies therein. Such proceeding is a collateral attack upon the judgment, and the only question for decision is whether the trial court possessed jurisdiction of the parties, jurisdiction of the subject matter and the power to impose the sentence. *Roehm v. Woodruff*, 64 N.M. 278, 327 P.2d 339 (1958).

Writ not used for collateral attack on contempt proceedings. - Attack on contempt proceedings collaterally for violation of a writ of mandamus may not be made by writ of habeas corpus, since the inquiry in habeas corpus is limited to the jurisdiction of the court. *Delgado v. Chavez*, 5 N.M. 646, 25 P. 948, *aff'd*, *In re Delgado*, 140 U.S. 586, 11 S. Ct. 874, 35 L. Ed. 578 (1891).

Writ of habeas corpus is in nature of collateral attack on a judgment upon which commitment has issued, and would lie only when the judgment under attack was absolutely void because the court which rendered the judgment was without jurisdiction. *Orosco v. Cox*, 75 N.M. 431, 405 P.2d 668 (1965).

And lie only when judgment absolutely void. - Writs of habeas corpus are collateral attacks upon the judgments upon which commitments are issued and will lie only when the judgment attacked is absolutely void for the reason that the court rendering it was without jurisdiction to do so. *Johnson v. Cox*, 72 N.M. 55, 380 P.2d 199, *cert. denied*, 375 U.S. 855, 84 S. Ct. 117, 11 L. Ed. 2d 82 (1963).

Inquiry directed to fairness of entire proceedings. - In determining whether the deprivation of constitutional rights amounts to a denial of due process, the inquiry on habeas corpus is directed to a review of the entire proceedings, and if the total result was the granting to accused of a fair and deliberate trial, then no constitutional right has been invaded, and the proceedings will not be disturbed. *Johnson v. Cox*, 72 N.M. 55, 380 P.2d 199, cert. denied, 375 U.S. 855, 84 S. Ct. 117, 11 L. Ed. 2d 82 (1963).

Function of writ of habeas corpus is not to review record for errors of the trial court, and where the petition states no facts showing petitioner is unlawfully deprived of his liberty, it will be denied. *Smith v. People*, 71 N.M. 112, 376 P.2d 54 (1962).

Incorrect assessment of fines curable by appeal not by writ. - Assessing fines for several acts and omissions on the part of relators, with alternative imprisonment, where such acts constituted but one offense, though irregular, does not make the entire punishment void, and is curable in the court below, or on appeal, but not by habeas corpus. *In re Sloan*, 5 N.M. 590, 25 P. 930 (1891).

Without prejudice, form of indictment not subject to writ. - In habeas corpus the form of an indictment or information is not open to review unless the petitioner has suffered prejudice from it. *Roehm v. Woodruff*, 64 N.M. 278, 327 P.2d 339 (1958).

III. Custody Of Child.

Writ used to consider custody of infant issues. - It is fundamental that under appropriate circumstances, habeas corpus is an available remedy by which to consider controversies involving the issue of custody of infants. *Roberts v. Staples*, 79 N.M. 298, 442 P.2d 788 (1968).

When determining custodial rights of children inquiry is generally broader. - The writ of habeas corpus finds its origin in common law. It issues as a matter of right and not as a matter of course. When prosecuted as a means of determining custodial rights of children, however, the inquiry is generally broader than that normally involved in habeas corpus. The child's welfare becomes a prime consideration irrespective of the parties' interests, although the natural rights of parents, guardians or lawful claimants are entitled to due consideration. *Roberts v. Staples*, 79 N.M. 298, 442 P.2d 788 (1968).

Custody granted only when prima facie legal right shown. - In cases dealing with infants, it is uniformly held that a writ of habeas corpus will be granted only in those cases where the applicant shows a prima facie legal right to the custody of the child. *Roberts v. Staples*, 79 N.M. 298, 442 P.2d 788 (1968).

Judgment from proceeding appealable. - A judgment in habeas corpus proceedings instituted to test the right of respective claimants to the custody of a minor is appealable. *Evens v. Keller*, 35 N.M. 659, 6 P.2d 200 (1931).

But former judgment in habeas corpus is res judicata. - A former adjudication in habeas corpus on the rights of rival claimants to the custody of a minor is conclusive between such parties in a subsequent proceeding involving the same question on the same state of facts existing at the time of the former adjudication. *Evens v. Keller*, 35 N.M. 659, 6 P.2d 200 (1931).

Grandparents have legal right to apply for writ of habeas corpus when the issue of custody of infants is involved. *Roberts v. Staples*, 79 N.M. 298, 442 P.2d 788 (1968).

§ 44-1-2. [Detention under judgment or execution; contempt.]

The following persons are not entitled to prosecute such writ: persons committed or detained by virtue of the final judgment, conviction or decree of any competent tribunal or by virtue of an execution issued upon such judgment or decree; but no order of commitment for any alleged contempt, or upon proceedings as for contempt, to enforce the rights or remedies of any party shall be deemed a judgment, conviction or decree within the meaning of this section; nor shall any attachment or other process issued upon any such order be deemed an execution within the meaning of this section.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 2; C.L. 1884, § 2013; C.L. 1897, § 2782; Code 1915, § 2590; C.S. 1929, § 63-102; 1941 Comp., § 25-1102; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-2.

Cross-references. - As to when petitioner will be remanded to custody, see 44-1-16 NMSA 1978.

Decision not by "competent" court when constitutional guarantees denied. - For a court to be competent, jurisdiction must be present, and that jurisdiction clearly may be lost. When certain constitutional guarantees are denied, overlooked or omitted, the conviction or sentence is not by a "competent" court. *Orosco v. Cox*, 75 N.M. 431, 405 P.2d 668 (1965).

In habeas corpus proceeding supreme court may receive evidence outside record to establish the absence or loss of jurisdiction through denial of any of the rights guaranteed to a prisoner at the bar by either the United States or New Mexico constitutions. *Orosco v. Cox*, 75 N.M. 431, 405 P.2d 668 (1965).

Law reviews. - For note, "Post-Conviction Relief After Release From Custody: A Federal Message and a New Mexico Remedy," see 9 Nat. Resources J. 85 (1969).

For article, "Prisoners Are People," see 10 Nat. Resources J. 869 (1970).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 64 to 73, 94 to 98.

Power to grant writ of habeas corpus pending appeal from conviction, 52 A.L.R. 876.
Illegal or erroneous sentence as ground for habeas corpus, 76 A.L.R. 468.

Change of judicial decision as ground for habeas corpus for release of one held upon previous adjudication of contempt, 136 A.L.R. 1032.

Habeas corpus to review commitment for contempt for failure to obey court order or decree either beyond power or jurisdiction of court or merely erroneous, 12 A.L.R.2d 1059.

39 C.J.S. Habeas Corpus §§ 81, 113.

§ 44-1-3. [Application for writ; to whom made; petition; signature; verification.]

Application for such writ shall be made by petition to any judge of the supreme court, signed and verified either by the party for whose relief it is intended, or by some person in his behalf, as follows: to the supreme or district court or to any judge thereof, being within the district where the prisoner is detained; or if there is no such officer within such district, or if he be absent or from any cause is incapable of acting, or has refused to grant such writ, then to some officer having such authority residing in any other district.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 3; C.L. 1884, § 2014; Laws 1889, ch. 17, § 2; C.L. 1897, § 2783; Code 1915, § 2591; C.S. 1929, § 63-103; 1941 Comp., § 25-1103; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-3.

Cross-references. - For the jurisdiction of the supreme court, see N.M. Const., art. VI, § 3. For the jurisdiction of the district courts, see N.M. Const., art. VI, § 13. For the contents of the petition, see 44-1-5 NMSA 1978. As to extraordinary writs from the supreme court, see Rule 12-504 SCRA 1986.

Court may grant writ releasing any prisoner within district. - One district court of this state may grant a writ of habeas corpus for the release from the state penitentiary of a prisoner held therein under a commitment from another district court. As the prisoner was being detained within the first judicial district, there can be no question that the court in that district had jurisdiction to consider intervenor's petition for habeas corpus. State ex rel. Hanagan v. District Court, 75 N.M. 390, 405 P.2d 232 (1965).

Therefore remedy of prohibition not available to state. - Where intervenor-defendant was ordered discharged from the custody of the warden of the penitentiary and the order was not appealed, it is accordingly final, and as intervenor was being detained within the first judicial district, there can be no question that respondent-district court judge had jurisdiction to consider intervenor's petition for habeas corpus and the remedy of prohibition is thus not available to the state. Rodriguez v. District Court, 83 N.M. 200, 490 P.2d 458 (1971).

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 117, 120, 121.

Denial of relief to prisoner on habeas corpus as bar to second application, 161 A.L.R. 1331.

Jurisdiction of habeas corpus proceedings for custody of child having legal domicile in other states, 4 A.L.R.2d 7.

Abuse of writ as basis for dismissal of state prisoner's second or successive petition for federal habeas corpus, 60 A.L.R. Fed. 481.

39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus §§ 161, 163, 165, 167.

§ 44-1-4. [Application to officer residing outside district of detention; jurisdictional proof required.]

Whenever application for any such writ is made to any officer not residing within the district where the prisoner is detained, he shall require proof by oath of the party applying, or by other sufficient evidence, that there is no officer in such district authorized to grant the writ; or if there is one, that he is absent or has refused to grant such writ; or for some cause, to be specially set forth, is incapable of acting, and if such proof is not produced, the application shall be denied.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 4; C.L. 1884, § 2015; C.L. 1897, § 2784; Code 1915, § 2592; C.S. 1929, § 63-104; 1941 Comp., § 25-1104; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-4.

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 105 to 109.

39 C.J.S. Habeas Corpus §§ 136 to 146.

§ 44-1-5. [Petition for writ; allegations; exhibits.]

The petition shall state in substance:

A. that the person in whose behalf the writ is applied for is imprisoned or restrained of his liberty, the officer or person by whom he is so confined or restrained and the place where, naming both parties, if their names are known, or describing them if they are not;

B. that such person is not committed or detained by virtue of any process, judgment, decree or execution, specified in Section 44-1-2 NMSA 1978;

C. the cause or pretense of such confinement or restraint, according to the knowledge or belief of the party verifying the petition;

D. if the confinement or restraint is by virtue of any warrant, or order, or process, a copy thereof shall be annexed, or it shall be averred that by reason of such prisoner being removed or concealed before application, a demand of such copy could not be made, or that such demand was made, and the legal fees therefor tendered to the officer or person having such prisoner in his custody, and that such copy was refused;

E. if the imprisonment is alleged to be illegal, the petition shall state in what the illegality consists.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 5; C.L. 1884, § 2016; C.L. 1897, § 2785; Code 1915, § 2593; C.S. 1929, § 63-105; 1941 Comp., § 25-1105; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-5.

Cross-references. - As to signature and verification of petition, see 44-1-3 NMSA 1978.

Post-conviction proceedings must be invoked before habeas corpus may be sought. In re Martinez, 99 N.M. 198, 656 P.2d 861 (1982).

Juvenile court justice is not proper party in habeas corpus proceeding; only persons having physical custody of petitioner and able to produce him in court may properly be named as respondent in such proceeding. Peyton v. Nord, 78 N.M. 717, 437 P.2d 716 (1968).

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 121 to 125.

Propriety of federal court's considering state prisoner's petition under 28 USCS § 2254 where prisoner has exhausted state remedies as to some, but not all, claims in petition, 43 A.L.R. Fed. 631.

Abuse of writ as basis for dismissal of state prisoner's second or successive petition for federal habeas corpus, 60 A.L.R. Fed. 481.

39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus §§ 168, 169.

§ 44-1-6. [Form of writ.]

Every writ of habeas corpus issued under the provisions of this chapter shall be substantially in the following form:

The state of New Mexico to the sheriff of, etc., or to A.B.:

You are hereby commanded to have the body of C.D., by you imprisoned and detained, as it is said, together with the time and cause of such imprisonment and detention, by whatever name the said C.D. shall be called or charged, before E.F., judge of the district court, as etc. (or immediately after the receipt of this writ), to do, and receive

what shall then and there be considered concerning the said C.D., and have you then and there this writ.

Witness, etc.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 6; C.L. 1884, § 2017; C.L. 1897, § 2786; Code 1915, § 2594; C.S. 1929, § 63-106; 1941 Comp., § 25-1106; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-6.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-1-1 NMSA 1978.

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 132. 39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 176.

§ 44-1-7. [Defects of form; names of prisoner and custodian.]

Such writ of habeas corpus shall not be disobeyed for any defect of form. It is sufficient:

A. if the person having the custody of the prisoner is designated either by his name or office, if he has any, or by his own name, or if both such names are unknown or uncertain, he may be described by any assumed appellation, and anyone who may be served with the writ, shall be deemed to be the person to whom it is directed, although it is directed to him by a wrong name or description, or to another person;

B. if the person who is directed to be produced is designated by name, or if his name is uncertain or unknown, he may be described in any other way so as to designate the person intended.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 7; C.L. 1884, § 2018; C.L. 1897, § 2787; Code 1915, § 2595; C.S. 1929, § 63-107; 1941 Comp., § 25-1107; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-7.

No civil liability for misconstruing when writ required. - Fact that district judge and law officer may have mistakenly concluded an order or writ was necessary to effect the release of child from unlawful detention charged in the criminal complaint, and that they may have misconstrued the nature of the order or writ which should be issued, did not confer upon plaintiff a right to recover damages for being compelled to release child from the unlawful imprisonment or restraint plaintiff was exercising over the child. Had a writ of habeas corpus been issued by the judge and served upon plaintiff, he could not be excused for disobedience thereof because of any defect of form. *Torres v. Glasgow*, 80 N.M. 412, 456 P.2d 886 (Ct. App. 1969).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 176.

§ 44-1-8. [Wrongful refusal of writ; forfeiture.]

If any officer herein authorized to grant writs of habeas corpus willfully refuses to grant such writ when legally applied for, he shall forfeit for any such offense, to the party aggrieved, one thousand dollars [(\$1,000)].

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 8; C.L. 1884, § 2019; C.L. 1897, § 2788; Code 1915, § 2596; C.S. 1929, § 63-108; 1941 Comp., § 25-1108; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-8.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 131. Liability of judge, court, administrative officer or other custodian of person for whose release the writ is sought, in connection with habeas corpus proceedings, 84 A.L.R. 807.
39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 175.

§ 44-1-9. [Return; contents; exhibits; signature; verification.]

The person upon whom such writ is duly served shall state in his return plainly and unequivocally:

- A. whether he has or has not the party in his custody, or control, or under his restraint, and, if he has not, whether he has had the party in his custody, or under his control or restraint, at any and what time prior or subsequent to the date of the writ;
- B. if he has the party in his custody or control, or under his restraint, the authority and true cause of such imprisonment or restraint, setting forth the same at large;
- C. if the party is detained by virtue of any writ, warrant or other written authority, a copy thereof shall be annexed to the return, and the original shall be produced and exhibited on the return of the writ to the officer before whom the same is returnable;
- D. if the person upon whom such writ is served has had the party in his control or custody, or under his restraint, at any time prior or subsequent to the date of the writ, but has transferred such custody or restraint to another, the return shall state particularly to whom, at what time, for what cause and by what authority such transfer took place. The return shall be signed by the person making the same, and except where such person is a sworn public officer and makes his return in his official capacity, it shall be verified by oath.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 9; C.L. 1884, § 2020; C.L. 1897, § 2789; Code 1915, § 2597; C.S. 1929, § 63-109; 1941 Comp., § 25-1109; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-9.

When petitioner not restrained no release order may be made. - Where on habeas corpus there is nothing to contradict the return of the sheriff, showing that at the date of

the petition the petitioner was not restrained of his liberty, an order releasing him from unlawful imprisonment may not be made. In re Brydon, 9 N.M. 647, 43 P. 691 (1889).

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 135 to 140.
39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus §§ 180 to 183.

§ 44-1-10. [Petitioner to be produced; exception.]

The person or officer on whom the writ is served shall bring the body of the person in his custody, according to the command of such writ, except in the case of the sickness of such person, as hereinafter provided in this chapter.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 10; C.L. 1884, § 2021; C.L. 1897, § 2790; Code 1915, § 2598; C.S. 1929, § 63-110; 1941 Comp., § 25-1110; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-10.

Cross-references. - For the procedure when petitioner is sick or infirm, see 44-1-26 NMSA 1978.

Meaning of "this chapter". - The compilers of the 1915 Code substituted "hereinafter provided in this chapter" for "hereinafter provided." The term "this chapter" refers to ch. 51 of the 1915 Code, the provisions of which are presently compiled as 44-1-1 to 44-1-37 NMSA 1978.

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 144.
39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 185.

§ 44-1-11. [Attachment for disobedience of writ; issuance; to whom directed; proceedings.]

If the person upon whom such writ is duly served refuses or neglects to obey the same, by producing the party named in such writ, and making a full and explicit return to every such writ within the time required by the provisions of this chapter, and no sufficient excuse is shown for such refusal or neglect, the officer before whom such writ is returnable, upon due proof of the service thereof, shall forthwith issue an attachment against such person, directed to the sheriff of any county in this state, and commanding him forthwith to apprehend such person and to bring him immediately before such officer, and on such person being so brought he shall be committed to close custody in

the jail of the county in which such officer is, until he makes return to such writ and complies with any order that may be made by such officer in relation to the person for whose relief such writ was issued.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 11; C.L. 1884, § 2022; C.L. 1897, § 2791; Code 1915, § 2599; C.S. 1929, § 63-111; 1941 Comp., § 25-1111; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-11.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-1-1 NMSA 1978.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 176, 177.

39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 187.

§ 44-1-12. [Attachment against sheriff; place of detention.]

If a sheriff neglects to return such writ the attachment may be directed to any person designated therein, who shall have full power to execute the same, and such sheriff upon being brought up may be committed to the jail of any county other than his own.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 12; C.L. 1884, § 2023; C.L. 1897, § 2792; Code 1915, § 2600; C.S. 1929, § 63-112; 1941 Comp., § 25-1112; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-12.

§ 44-1-13. [Precept for production of petitioner by officer executing attachment.]

The officer by whom any such attachment is issued may also at the same time or afterward issue a precept to the sheriff, or other person to whom such attachment was directed, commanding him to bring forthwith before such officers the party for whose benefit such writ was allowed, who shall thereafter remain in the custody of such sheriff or person until he is discharged, bailed or remanded, as such officer directs.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 13; C.L. 1884, § 2024; C.L. 1897, § 2793; Code 1915, § 2601; C.S. 1929, § 63-113; 1941 Comp., § 25-1113; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-13.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 145.
39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 185.

§ 44-1-14. [Hearing.]

The officer before whom such party is brought on such writ shall immediately after the return thereof, proceed to examine into the facts contained in such return, and into the

cause of the confinement or restraint of such party, whether the same was before commitment for any criminal charge or not.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 14; C.L. 1884, § 2025; C.L. 1897, § 2794; Code 1915, § 2602; C.S. 1929, § 63-114; 1941 Comp., § 25-1114; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-14.

Cross-references. - For additional provisions governing hearings, see 44-1-24, 44-1-25 NMSA 1978.

Pardoned prisoners not legally interested when warden enjoined from releasing them. - Where the superintendent (now warden) of the penitentiary has been enjoined from releasing prisoners pardoned by the governor, such persons are not legally interested in the question as to whether the superintendent has violated the injunction in allowing them to be arrested for another crime, but such question is between the superintendent and the court which issued the injunction. *Ex parte Bustillos*, 26 N.M. 449, 194 P. 886 (1920).

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 142, 143.

Right to prove absence from demanding state or alibi on habeas corpus in extradition proceedings, 61 A.L.R. 715.

Bar of limitations as proper subject of investigation in extradition proceedings or in habeas corpus proceedings for release of one sought to be extradited, 77 A.L.R. 902.

Right to aid of counsel in application or hearing for habeas corpus, 162 A.L.R. 1922. 39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus §§ 207 to 209.

§ 44-1-15. [When petitioner will be discharged.]

If no legal cause is shown for such imprisonment or restraint, or for the continuation thereof, such officer shall discharge such party from the custody or restraint under which he is held.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 15; C.L. 1884, § 2026; C.L. 1897, § 2795; Code 1915, § 2603; C.S. 1929, § 63-115; 1941 Comp., § 25-1115; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-15.

Function of writ of habeas corpus is not to review record for errors of the trial court, and where the petition states no facts showing petitioner is unlawfully deprived of his liberty, it will be denied. *Smith v. People*, 71 N.M. 112, 376 P.2d 54 (1962).

No appeal lies from decision of district court in habeas corpus proceedings. *In re Forest*, 45 N.M. 204, 113 P.2d 582 (1941).

Inability to pay support money negates sentence on habeas corpus. - Present ability to pay arrears of monthly sums allowed for support of children is essential to the validity of a contempt sentence to continue until payment, and where record shows that such sentence was imposed in absence of ability to pay, the sentence must be held for naught on habeas corpus. Ex parte Sedillo, 34 N.M. 98, 278 P. 202 (1929).

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 156. Right of state or public officer to appeal from an order in habeas corpus releasing one from custody, 10 A.L.R. 385; 30 A.L.R. 1322.

Arresting one who has been discharged on habeas corpus, 62 A.L.R. 462.

Right to appeal from conviction as affected by discharge on habeas corpus, 74 A.L.R. 641.

Discharge on habeas corpus after conviction as affecting claim or plea of former jeopardy, 97 A.L.R. 160.

39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 228.

§ 44-1-16. [When petitioner will be remanded to custody.]

The officer shall forthwith remand such party, if it appears that he is detained in custody, either:

A. by virtue of process issued by any court or judge of the United States in a case where such court or judge has exclusive jurisdiction; or

B. by virtue of the final judgment or decree of any competent court, or of any execution issued upon such judgment or decree; or

C. for any contempt, specially and plainly charged in the commitment by some court, officer or body having authority to commit for the contempt so charged; and

D. that the time during which such party may be legally detained has not expired.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 16; C.L. 1884, § 2027; C.L. 1897, § 2796; Code 1915, § 2604; C.S. 1929, § 63-116; 1941 Comp., § 25-1116; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-16.

Decision not by "competent" court when constitutional guarantees denied. - For a court to be competent, jurisdiction must be present, and that jurisdiction clearly may be lost. When certain constitutional guarantees are denied, overlooked or omitted, the conviction or sentence is not by a "competent" court. Orosco v. Cox, 75 N.M. 431, 405 P.2d 668 (1965).

Petitioner remanded if facts constituting contempt appear on petition's face. - If the facts required in the third subdivision (Subsection C) appear on the face of the petition, the motion to dismiss and remand should be allowed. In re Sloan, 5 N.M. 590, 25 P. 930 (1891).

Law reviews. - For article, "Prisoners Are People," see 10 Nat. Resources J. 869 (1970).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 157. 39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 221.

§ 44-1-17. [Causes for discharge of petitioner in custody under civil process.]

If it appears on the return that the prisoner is in custody by virtue of civil process of any court legally constituted, or issued by an officer in the course of judicial proceedings before him, authorized by law, such prisoner can only be discharged in one of the following cases:

- A. when the jurisdiction of such court or officer has been exceeded either as to matter, place, sum or person;
- B. where, though the original imprisonment was lawful, yet by some act, omission or event which has taken place afterward, the party is entitled to be discharged;
- C. where the process is defective in some matter of substance required by law rendering such process void;
- D. where the process, though in proper form, has been issued in a case not allowed by law;
- E. where the person having the custody of the prisoner under such process is not the person empowered by law to detain him; or
- F. where the process is not authorized by any judgment, order or decree of any court, nor by any provision of law.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 17; C.L. 1884, § 2028; C.L. 1897, § 2797; Code 1915, § 2605; C.S. 1929, § 63-117; 1941 Comp., § 25-1117; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-17.

No constitutional right invaded if trial's total result was fair. - In determining whether the deprivation of constitutional rights amounts to a denial of due process the inquiry on habeas corpus is directed to a review of the entire proceedings, and if the total result was the granting to accused of a fair and deliberate trial, then no constitutional right has

been invaded, and the proceedings will not be disturbed. *Orosco v. Cox*, 75 N.M. 431, 405 P.2d 668 (1965).

In habeas corpus proceeding supreme court may receive evidence outside record to establish the absence or loss of jurisdiction through denial of any of the rights guaranteed to a prisoner at the bar by either the United States or New Mexico constitutions. *Orosco v. Cox*, 75 N.M. 431, 405 P.2d 668 (1965).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 90.
Habeas corpus to test constitutionality of ordinance under which petitioner is held, 32 A.L.R. 1054.

Habeas corpus in case of sentence which is excessive because imposing both fine and imprisonment, 49 A.L.R. 494.

Power to grant writ of habeas corpus pending appeal from conviction, 52 A.L.R. 876.

Habeas corpus as remedy for delay in bringing accused to trial or to retrial after reversal, 58 A.L.R. 1510.

Illegal or erroneous sentence as ground for habeas corpus, 76 A.L.R. 468.

Habeas corpus as remedy where one is convicted, upon plea of guilty or after trial, of offense other than one charged in indictment or information, 154 A.L.R. 1135.

Mistreatment of prisoner lawfully in custody as ground for habeas corpus, 155 A.L.R. 145.

39 C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 110.

§ 44-1-18. [Legality or justice of judgment or execution.]

But no officer on the return of any habeas corpus can inquire into the legality or justice of any judgment, decree or execution specified in Section 44-1-16 NMSA 1978.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 18; C.L. 1884, § 2029; C.L. 1897, § 2798; Code 1915, § 2606; C.S. 1929, § 63-118; 1941 Comp., § 25-1118; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-18.

Legality of imprisonment does not rest upon mittimus, but upon judgment, and a prisoner who has been legally and properly sentenced to prison cannot obtain his discharge simply because there is an imperfection, or error, in the mittimus. *Shankle v. Woodruff*, 64 N.M. 88, 324 P.2d 1017 (1958).

Valid judgment is not nullified by flaws in the commitment. *Shankle v. Woodruff*, 64 N.M. 88, 324 P.2d 1017 (1958).

Objections to information not grounds for release. - Petitioner's objections to an information, if valid and the error reserved, might make the basis of a timely appeal but are not grounds for release on habeas corpus. *Shankle v. Woodruff*, 64 N.M. 88, 324 P.2d 1017 (1958).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 64.
39 C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 81.

§ 44-1-19. [Petitioner legally committed or guilty of offense; release on bail.]

If it appears that the party has been legally committed for any criminal offense, or if he appears, by the testimony offered with the return upon the hearing thereof, to be guilty of such an offense, although the commitment is irregular, the officer before whom such party is brought shall proceed to let such party to bail, if the case be bailable and good bail is offered, or if not, shall forthwith remand such party.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 19; C.L. 1884, § 2030; C.L. 1897, § 2799; Code 1915, § 2607; C.S. 1929, § 63-119; 1941 Comp., § 25-1119; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-19.

Cross-references. - For habeas corpus proceedings to obtain release on bail, see 44-1-23, 44-1-24 NMSA 1978.

This section does not require granting of bail in every case. 1974 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 74-38.

Petitioner remanded for new sentence where illegality is void sentence. - Where illegality of restraint complained of in habeas corpus is imposition of void sentence on legal conviction, petitioner should be remanded or detained for new sentence. *Jordan v. Swope*, 36 N.M. 84, 8 P.2d 788 (1932).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 64.
39 C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 36.

§ 44-1-20. [Decision in other cases.]

In other cases the party shall be placed in custody of the person legally entitled thereto, or if no one is so entitled, he shall be discharged.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 20; C.L. 1884, § 2031; C.L. 1897, § 2800; Code 1915, § 2608; C.S. 1929, § 63-120; 1941 Comp., § 25-1120; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-20.

Petitioner remanded for new sentence where illegality is void sentence. - See same catchline in notes to 44-1-19 NMSA 1978.

§ 44-1-21. [Custody of petitioner pending decision.]

Until judgment is given upon the action, the officer before whom such party is brought may either commit such party to the custody of the sheriff of the county in which such officer is, or place him in such care or under such custody as his age and other circumstances require.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 21; C.L. 1884, § 2032; C.L. 1897, § 2801; Code 1915, § 2609; C.S. 1929, § 63-121; 1941 Comp., § 25-1121; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-21.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 145. 39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 185.

§ 44-1-22. [Notice of hearing.]

In criminal cases, notice of the time and place at which the writ is made returnable shall be given to the district attorney, if he is within the county; in other cases like notice shall be given to any person interested in continuing the custody or restraint of the party seeking the aid of said writ.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 22; C.L. 1884, § 2033; C.L. 1897, § 2802; Code 1915, § 2610; C.S. 1929, § 63-122; 1941 Comp., § 25-1122; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-22.

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 166.

§ 44-1-23. [Bail proceedings; authorization of habeas corpus; committing magistrate's proceedings to be reviewed.]

Hereafter all persons to whom bail has been denied or who are confined for failure to give bail, may have the benefit of a writ of habeas corpus for the purpose of being admitted to bail or having the bail reduced, and the court or judge shall, upon habeas corpus, review the proceedings or action of a committing magistrate.

History: Laws 1889, ch. 29, § 1; C.L. 1897, § 2803; Code 1915, § 2611; C.S. 1929, § 63-123; 1941 Comp., § 25-1123; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-23.

Cross-references. - As to release on bail, see 44-1-19 NMSA 1978. As to bail generally, see Rule 5-401 SCRA 1986.

Compiler's notes. - This section, as enacted, contained at the beginning a clause repealing 2034, 1884 C.L. The clause was omitted by the compilers of the 1915 Code.

Bail not mandatory after issuance of warrant in extradition case. - This section does not require the granting of bail in every case nor does it require bail after issuance of a governor's warrant in an extradition case. 1974 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 74-38.

Former statute prevented bail in capital case where proof evident. - Supreme court did not find it necessary to determine whether the constitution prohibited bail to persons coming within the exception set forth in N.M. Const., art. II, § 13, concerning persons accused of capital offenses, when proof is evident or presumption great, because 41-4-5, 1953 Comp. (since repealed) expressly prohibited the granting of bail to such defendants. Therefore, magistrate had no discretion to allow bail, since his determination was that, as to the defendants, the proof was evident or the presumption great. *Tijerina v. Baker*, 78 N.M. 770, 438 P.2d 514 (1968).

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 40 to 43. Bail pending appeal in habeas corpus, 63 A.L.R. 1460. 39 C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 111.

§ 44-1-24. [Certiorari to committing magistrate; transcript; examination of case de novo; decision.]

When an application is made before any authority authorized by law to issue such writs of habeas corpus it shall be the duty of such officers to issue a writ of certiorari commanding the committing magistrate forthwith to send to said officers a full and complete transcript of all his proceedings had thereof, and the said officer upon the return of such writ shall proceed to examine the case de novo and either commit to jail, discharge or recognize such person to appear before the district court as the case may require.

History: Laws 1889, ch. 29, § 2; C.L. 1897, § 2804; Code 1915, § 2612; C.S. 1929, § 63-124; 1941 Comp., § 25-1124; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-24.

§ 44-1-25. [Pleading by petitioner after return; summary hearing.]

The party brought before any such officer on the return of any writ of habeas corpus, may deny any of the material facts set forth in the return, or allege any fact to show, either that his imprisonment or detention is unlawful, or that he is entitled to his discharge, which allegations or denials shall be on oath; and thereupon such officer shall proceed in a summary way to hear such allegations and proofs as are legally produced in support of such imprisonment or detention or against the same, and to dispose of such party as justice requires.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 24; C.L. 1884, § 2035; C.L. 1897, § 2805; Code 1915, § 2613; C.S. 1929, § 63-125; 1941 Comp., § 25-1125, 1953 Comp., § 22-11-25.

Petitioner may allege and show void character of conviction. - When a return to writ asserts that petitioner is held under a commitment issued pursuant to a judgment of a district court, the petitioner may deny the facts alleged in the return, and himself allege and show facts to establish the void character of his conviction and illegality of his detention. *Orosco v. Cox*, 75 N.M. 431, 405 P.2d 668 (1965).

In habeas corpus proceeding supreme court may receive evidence outside the record to establish the absence or loss of jurisdiction through denial of any of the rights guaranteed to a prisoner at the bar by either the United States or New Mexico constitutions. *Orosco v. Cox*, 75 N.M. 431, 405 P.2d 668 (1965).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 142. 39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 188.

§ 44-1-26. [Procedure when petitioner is sick or infirm.]

Whenever from the sickness or infirmity of the person directed to be produced by any writ of habeas corpus such person cannot, without danger, be brought before the officer before whom the suit is made returnable, the party in whose custody he is may state the fact in his return to the writ, verifying the same by his oath; and if such officer is satisfied of the truth of such allegation and the return is otherwise sufficient, he shall proceed to decide upon such return and to dispose of the matter; and if it appears that the person detained is illegally imprisoned, confined or restrained of his liberty, the officer shall order those having such person in their custody to discharge him forthwith; and if it appears that such person is legally detained, imprisoned and confined, and is not entitled to be bailed, such officer shall dismiss the proceedings.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 25; C.L. 1884, § 2036; C.L. 1897, § 2806; Code 1915, § 2614; C.S. 1929, § 63-126; 1941 Comp., § 25-1126; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-26.

§ 44-1-27. [Disobedience of order for discharge; attachment; damages recoverable.]

Obedience to any order for the discharge of any prisoner, granted pursuant to the provisions of this chapter, may be enforced by the officer issuing such writ or granting such order, by attachment, in the same manner as herein provided for a neglect to make a return to a writ of habeas corpus, and the person guilty of such disobedience shall forfeit to the party aggrieved, one thousand dollars [(\$1,000)] in addition to any special damages such party may have sustained.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 26; C.L. 1884, § 2037; C.L. 1897, § 2807; Code 1915, § 2615; C.S. 1929, § 63-127; 1941 Comp., § 25-1127; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-27.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-1-1 NMSA 1978.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 176, 177.

Liability for statutory penalty of judge, court, administrative officer or other custodian of person, in connection with habeas corpus proceedings, 84 A.L.R. 807.

39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 187.

§ 44-1-28. [Detention for same offense after discharge on habeas corpus prohibited; when permissible.]

No person who has been discharged upon a habeas corpus shall be again imprisoned or restrained for the same cause, unless indicted therefor, convicted thereof or committed for want of bail by some court of record having jurisdiction of the cause; or unless after a discharge for a defect of proof or for some material defect in the commitment in a criminal case, he is again arrested on sufficient proof and committed by legal process.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 27; C.L. 1884, § 2038; C.L. 1897, § 2808; Code 1915, § 2616; C.S. 1929, § 63-128; 1941 Comp., § 25-1128; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-28.

Civil res judicata limitations apply to criminal cases. - The doctrine of res judicata, as applied to criminal cases, is subject to the same limitations as apply in civil cases. *State v. Nance*, 77 N.M. 39, 419 P.2d 242 (1966), cert. denied, 386 U.S. 1039, 87 S. Ct. 1495, 18 L. Ed. 2d 605 (1967).

Judgment res judicata to issues necessary to determine detention's legality. - An order or judgment discharging one in habeas corpus is conclusive as to the illegality of the detention or imprisonment and is res judicata of those issues of law and fact necessary to the determination of the legality of the detention. *State v. Nance*, 77 N.M. 39, 419 P.2d 242 (1966), cert. denied, 386 U.S. 1039, 87 S. Ct. 1495, 18 L. Ed. 2d 605 (1967).

Release by writ does not exonerate from charges. - When defendants obtained a release from custody by the writ, they were not exonerated from the charges for which they were sentenced. The only effect of the release was to set aside their pleas and the sentence. They may then be again proceeded against as though there has been no prior proceedings. *State v. Nance*, 77 N.M. 39, 419 P.2d 242 (1966), cert. denied, 386 U.S. 1039, 87 S. Ct. 1495, 18 L. Ed. 2d 605 (1967).

Other findings gratuitous when release based upon specific ground. - Where petitioners were successful in the habeas corpus proceeding because the court found that they had not been afforded effective counsel at trial, any finding that their confessions were

involuntary was gratuitous and not necessary to the decision, and therefore not res judicata. State v. Nance, 77 N.M. 39, 419 P.2d 242 (1966), cert. denied, 386 U.S. 1039, 87 S. Ct. 1495, 18 L. Ed. 2d 605 (1967).

"Former jeopardy" clause of constitution does not preclude a retrial of a defendant whose sentence is set aside because of an error in the proceedings leading to the sentence or conviction. This is equally true where the conviction is overturned on collateral rather than direct attack, by petition for habeas corpus, for example. State v. Nance, 77 N.M. 39, 419 P.2d 242 (1966), cert. denied, 386 U.S. 1039, 87 S. Ct. 1495, 18 L. Ed. 2d 605 (1967).

Retrial after release on writ not double jeopardy. - Where defendant served more than a year for prior conviction of larceny before being released on habeas corpus due to lack of jurisdiction, subsequent trial for same offense did not constitute double jeopardy. State v. Paris, 76 N.M. 291, 414 P.2d 512 (1966).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - Arresting one who has been discharged on habeas corpus or released on bail, 62 A.L.R. 462.

§ 44-1-29. [Concealment or transfer of prisoner to avoid writ; forfeiture.]

If anyone, who has in his custody, or under his control, a person entitled to a writ of habeas corpus, whether a writ has been issued or not, transfers such prisoner to the custody, or places him under the power or control of another person, or conceals him, or changes the place of his confinement, with intent to elude the service of such writ, or to avoid the effect thereof, the person so offending shall forfeit to the party aggrieved thereby the sum of four hundred dollars [(\$400)], to be recovered in a civil action.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 28; C.L. 1884, § 2039; C.L. 1897, § 2809; Code 1915, § 2617; C.S. 1929, § 63-129; 1941 Comp., § 25-1129; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-29.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 176, 177.

Liability of judge, court administrative officer or other custodian of person for whose release the writ is sought, in connection with habeas corpus proceedings, 84 A.L.R. 807.

39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 187.

§ 44-1-30. [Detention officer refusing to furnish copies; forfeiture.]

Any officer, or other person, refusing to deliver a copy of any order, warrant, process or other authority, by which he detains any person, to anyone who demands such copy

and tenders the fees thereof, shall forfeit two hundred dollars [(\$200)] to the person so detained.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 29; C.L. 1884, § 2040; C.L. 1897, § 2810; Code 1915, § 2618; C.S. 1929, § 63-130; 1941 Comp., § 25-1130; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-30.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 176, 177.

Liability of judge, court administrative officer or other custodian of person for whose release the writ is sought, in connection with habeas corpus proceedings, 84 A.L.R. 807.

39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 187.

§ 44-1-31. [When writ returnable; seal.]

Every writ of habeas corpus may be made returnable at a day certain, or forthwith, as the case may require, and shall be under the seal of the court.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 30; C.L. 1884, § 2041; C.L. 1897, § 2811; Code 1915, § 2619; C.S. 1929, § 63-131; 1941 Comp., § 25-1131; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-31.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 136.
39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 180.

§ 44-1-32. [Who may serve writ; tender of fees; bond for costs and restoration of prisoner.]

It can only be served by an elector of this state, and the service thereof shall not be deemed complete unless the party serving the same tenders to the person in whose custody the prisoner is, if such person is a sheriff, constable or marshal, the fees allowed by law for bringing up such prisoner. The officer granting the writ may, in his discretion, require a bond in a penalty not exceeding one thousand dollars [(\$1,000)], with sufficient sureties, conditioned that the obligators will pay all costs and expenses of the proceeding, and the reasonable charges of restoring the prisoner to the person from whose custody he was taken, if he is remanded. Such bond shall run to the sheriff of the county and be filed in the office of the clerk of the court from which the writ issues.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 31; C.L. 1884, § 2042; C.L. 1897, § 2812; Code 1915, § 2620; C.S. 1929, § 63-132; 1941 Comp., § 25-1132; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-32.

Cross-references. - As to sheriff's fees for producing prisoner, see 44-1-37 NMSA 1978.

Intention that petitioner either post bond or pay costs. - The evident intention of the legislature under this section is that the petitioner might advance the costs to the person

in charge of the prisoner or that the officer might require bond for the payment of all costs. *Burch v. Roberson*, 17 N.M. 405, 132 P. 1137 (1913).

Taxing of costs done pursuant to section. - The taxing of costs under the terms of the bond, by the supreme court, is not an exercise of discretion, but is pursuant to this section. *Burch v. Roberson*, 17 N.M. 405, 132 P. 1137 (1913).

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus §§ 133, 165 to 167.
39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus §§ 177, 235.

§ 44-1-33. [Service by delivery to custodian or person to whom writ is directed.]

Every writ of habeas corpus issued pursuant to this chapter may be served by delivering the same to the person to whom it is directed. If he cannot be found, it may be served by being left at the jail or other place in which the prisoner is confined, with any under officer or other person of proper age having charge for the time of such prisoner.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 32; C.L. 1884, § 2043; C.L. 1897, § 2813; Code 1915, § 2621; C.S. 1929, § 63-133; 1941 Comp., § 25-1133; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-33.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-1-1 NMSA 1978.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 177.

§ 44-1-34. [Service by posting.]

If the person on whom the writ ought to be served, conceals himself, or refuses admittance to the party attempting to serve the same, it may be served by affixing the same in some conspicuous place on the outside, either of his dwelling house or of the place where the party is confined.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 33; C.L. 1884, § 2044; C.L. 1897, § 2814; Code 1915, § 2622; C.S. 1929, § 63-134; 1941 Comp., § 25-1134; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-34.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 177.

§ 44-1-35. [Time allowed for making return and producing prisoner.]

If the writ is returnable at a certain day, such return shall be made, and such prisoner produced at the time and place specified therein; if he is returnable forthwith, and the place is within twenty miles of the place of service, such return shall be made and such prisoner produced within twenty-four hours, and the like time shall be allowed for every additional twenty miles.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 34; C.L. 1884, § 2045; C.L. 1897, § 2815; Code 1915, § 2623; C.S. 1929, § 63-135; 1941 Comp., § 25-1135; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-35.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 39 Am. Jur. 2d Habeas Corpus § 136.
39A C.J.S. Habeas Corpus § 180.

§ 44-1-36. [Compelling attendance of prisoner for trial or as witness.]

Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrain the power of any court to issue a writ of habeas corpus when necessary to bring before them any prisoner for trial, in any criminal case lawfully pending in the same court, or to bring any prisoner to be examined as a witness in any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, pending in such court, when they think the personal attendance and examination of the witness necessary for the attainment of justice.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 35; C.L. 1884, § 2046; C.L. 1897, § 2816; Code 1915, § 2624; C.S. 1929, § 63-136; 1941 Comp., § 25-1136; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-36.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-1-1 NMSA 1978.

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

§ 44-1-37. [Sheriff's fees for producing prisoner.]

The sheriff or person who shall be required to bring up a person on habeas corpus, if the person be held by virtue of any legal process directed to such person as an officer, shall be entitled to the same fees and allowances as are allowed to sheriffs for removing prisoners in other cases.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 36; C.L. 1884, § 2047; C.L. 1897, § 2817; Code 1915, § 2625; C.S. 1929, § 63-137; 1941 Comp., § 25-1137; 1953 Comp., § 22-11-37.

Cross-references. - As to county officers not receiving, for their own use, fees in addition to salary, see N.M. Const., art. X, § 1 and 4-44-21 NMSA 1978. For the tender

of fees to person having custody, see 44-1-32 NMSA 1978. As to sheriff's expenses generally, see 4-41-18, 4-41-19, 4-44-18 NMSA 1978.

§ 44-1-38. [Federal court proceedings; payment of costs, fees and expenses by state penitentiary.]

If the petition for the writ is filed in any federal court, all the reasonably necessary costs, fees and expenses incurred or paid by the respondent shall be paid by the penitentiary of New Mexico. The budget of the penitentiary shall include an item for the anticipated expenses of habeas corpus proceedings. If budgeted funds shall not be sufficient to pay the costs and expenses that will arise, an emergency allowance from the state court fund shall be allowed upon application of the warden of the penitentiary to the state board of finance.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-11-41, enacted by Laws 1963, ch. 178, § 4.

Law reviews. - For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Article 2

Mandamus

§ 44-2-1. [Regulation of mandamus.]

The writ of mandamus is regulated as in this chapter prescribed.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 37; C.L. 1884, § 1992; C.L. 1897, § 2760; Code 1915, § 3411; C.S. 1929, § 86-101; 1941 Comp., § 26-101; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-1.

Meaning of "this chapter". - The original act, Laws 1884, ch. 1, was divided into three unnumbered divisions, habeas corpus, §§ 1 to 36; mandamus, §§ 37 to 50; and prohibition, §§ 51 to 56. The term "this chapter" appeared in the original act and apparently referred to the division containing §§ 37 to 50, presently compiled as 44-2-1 to 44-2-13 NMSA 1978.

Section limits and defines court's mandamus power. - Under and by virtue of this section, the power of the court in a mandamus proceeding is limited and defined. Board of Comm'rs v. District Court, 29 N.M. 244, 223 P. 516 (1924).

Denomination of pleading irrelevant since allegations and relief determine nature. - It matters not what the pleading initiating the proceeding may be denominated. If in truth it discloses by its allegations and the relief sought that it is an action in mandamus, it will be so treated. *Laumbach v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 60 N.M. 226, 290 P.2d 1067 (1955).

Law reviews. - For article, "Mandamus in New Mexico," see 4 N.M. L. Rev. 155 (1974).

For survey, "Torts: Sovereign and Governmental Immunity in New Mexico," see 6 N.M. L. Rev. 249 (1976).

For note, "Mandamus Proceedings Against Public Officials: State of New Mexico ex rel. *Bird v. Apodaca*," see 9 N.M.L. Rev. 195 (1978-79).

For article, "Survey of New Mexico Law, 1979-80: Administrative Law," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 1 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus § 1 et seq.
Allowance of attorney's fees in mandamus proceedings, 34 A.L.R.4th 457.
55 C.J.S. Mandamus § 1 et seq.

§ 44-2-2. [District courts open at all times for issuance of writs.]

For the purpose of hearing application for, and issuing writs of mandamus, the district courts shall be regarded as open at all times, wherever the judge of such court may be within the state.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 50; C.L. 1884, § 2005; C.L. 1897, § 2774; Code 1915, § 3412; C.S. 1929, § 86-102; 1941 Comp., § 26-102; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-2.

Writ may issue in vacation. - A judge of a district court may issue a peremptory writ of mandamus in vacation. *Delgado v. Chavez*, 5 N.M. 646, 25 P. 948, aff'd, 140 U.S. 586, 11 S. Ct. 874, 35 L. Ed. 578 (1891).

§ 44-2-3. [Exclusive original jurisdiction; district and supreme courts.]

The district court has exclusive original jurisdiction in all cases of mandamus, except where such writ is to be directed to a district court or a judge thereof in his official capacity, in which case the supreme court has exclusive original jurisdiction, and in such cases the supreme court or a judge thereof shall first make a rule, returnable in term, that such district court or judge thereof, show cause before the court why a peremptory writ of mandamus should not issue, and upon the return day of such rule such district court or judge may show cause against the rule by affidavit or record,

evidence, and upon the hearing thereof, the supreme court shall award a peremptory writ, or dismiss the rule. In case of emergency, a judge of the supreme court, at the time of making the rule to show cause, may also appoint a special term of the court for hearing the motion, and at which the rule shall be made returnable.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 48; C.L. 1884, § 2003; C.L. 1897, § 2771; Code 1915, § 3423; C.S. 1929, § 86-113; 1941 Comp., § 26-103; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-3.

Cross-references. - For the constitutional provision granting the supreme court original jurisdiction in mandamus, against state offices, boards and commissions, and power to issue writs of mandamus for the complete exercise of its jurisdiction, see N.M. Const., art. VI, § 3. As to the terms, sessions and recesses of the supreme court, see N.M. Const., art. VI, § 7. As to the power of the district courts to issue mandamus, see N.M. Const., art. VI, § 13. As to extraordinary writs in the supreme court, see Rule 12-504 SCRA 1986.

Supreme court of New Mexico exercises constitutionally invested original jurisdiction in mandamus against all state officers, boards and commissions. *State ex rel. Segó v. Kirkpatrick*, 86 N.M. 359, 524 P.2d 975 (1974).

Jurisdiction given supreme court by this section is limited by 44-2-4 and 44-2-5 NMSA 1978. *State ex rel. Sweeney v. Second Judicial Dist.*, 17 N.M. 282, 127 P. 23 (1912).

Judgment of district court in mandamus proceedings may be modified on appeal. *Territory ex rel. Coler v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 14 N.M. 134, 89 P. 252 (1907), *aff'd*, 215 U.S. 296, 30 S. Ct. 111, 54 L. Ed. 202 (1909).

Law reviews. - For article, "Mandamus in New Mexico," see 4 N.M. L. Rev. 155 (1974).

For note, "Mandamus Proceedings Against Public Officials: State of New Mexico *ex rel. Bird v. Apodaca*," see 9 N.M.L. Rev. 195 (1978-79).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus §§ 12 to 15, 21 to 26, 432, 433.

Discretion of appellate court to refuse exercise of its original jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus, 165 A.L.R. 1431.

55 C.J.S. Mandamus §§ 240, 272 to 274.

§ 44-2-4. [Purpose of writ; judicial discretion not controlled.]

It may be issued to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board or person, to compel the performance of an act which the law specially enjoins as a duty resulting from an office, trust or station; but though it may require an inferior tribunal to exercise its judgment, or proceed to the discharge of any of its functions, it cannot control judicial discretion.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 38; C.L. 1884, § 1993; C.L. 1897, § 2761; Code 1915, § 3413; C.S. 1929, § 86-103; 1941 Comp., § 26-104; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-4.

- I. General Consideration.
- II. Purpose of Section.
 - A. In General.
 - B. Judicial Acts.
 - C. Acts by Public Officials.
- III. Type of Duty.
 - A. Ministerial.
 - B. Discretionary.

I. General Consideration.

Cross-references. - For the supreme court's jurisdiction and authority with respect to the writ of mandamus, see N.M. Const., art. VI, § 3 and notes thereto. As to the court's issuance of the writ while in vacation, see 44-2-2 NMSA 1978. For provision that mandamus may be brought to compel county clerk to register voter, see 1-4-21 NMSA 1978. As to mandamus to compel canvass by county canvassing board, see 1-13-12 NMSA 1978. For the use of the writ to compel recounts or rechecks of election results, see 1-14-21 NMSA 1978. As to use of writ to compel secretary of state to examine referendum, see 1-17-3 NMSA 1978. As to right of bond holders to compel tax levy for courthouse, jail or bridge bonds, see 4-49-21 NMSA 1978. As to use of writ to compel compliance with the Subdivision Act, see 47-6-26 NMSA 1978. For the right of an employee to use writ to compel the director of the environmental improvement division to initiate emergency procedures pursuant to the Occupational Health and Safety Act, see 50-9-14 NMSA 1978. For right of reviewing court to direct the director of the financial institutions division of the regulation and licensing department (formerly commissioner of banking) to take action as affirmatively required by law, see 58-1-45 NMSA 1978. As to mandamus not being permitted to prevent a finding suspending or revoking a liquor license, see 60-6C-6 NMSA 1978. As to use of writ by and against public service commission, see 62-12-1, 62-12-2 NMSA 1978. As to conservancy districts enforcing regulations by use of writ, see 73-14-43, 73-17-9 NMSA 1978.

Writ enforces only clear legal rights. - It is a well-established doctrine in the law relating to mandamus that only clear legal rights are subject to enforcement by the writ. *Schreiber v. Baca*, 58 N.M. 766, 276 P.2d 902 (1954).

Act beyond power or dependent on nonparty's will not required. - The writ of mandamus will not require the performance of an act beyond the power of the respondent or dependent upon the will of a third person not a party to the suit. *Territory ex rel. Lester v. Suddith*, 15 N.M. 728, 110 P. 1038 (1910).

Not issued when no reason to suppose noncompliance with order. - Where the warden who was sought to be compelled by writ had not appealed and there was no claim that he was not bound by the trial court's decision, the supreme court had no reason to suppose that he would not comply with it, and declined to assume he would not, and thus, defendant had suffered no prejudice by the trial court's denial of the writ, nor was prejudice to him presently threatened. *Apodaca v. Rodriguez*, 84 N.M. 338, 503 P.2d 318 (1972).

Will issue if governor exceeds constitutional authority. - The exercise of the veto power requires judgment and discretion on the part of the governor and he cannot be compelled by the legislature or by this court to exercise this power or to exercise it in a particular manner. However, the manner in which the governor exercises the power is not beyond judicial review or judicial control. When the manner in which it is exercised is beyond the governor's constitutional authority, mandamus is a proper proceeding in which to question not only the constitutionality of legislative enactments, but also the constitutionality of vetoes or attempted vetoes by the governor. *State ex rel. Sego v. Kirkpatrick*, 86 N.M. 359, 524 P.2d 975 (1974).

Or when administrative board exceeds its jurisdiction. - Generally mandamus will not lie to control the discretion of an administrative board. But an exception to the general rule is recognized where the administrative board has acted unlawfully or wholly outside its jurisdiction or authority, or where it had abused its discretion. *Sanderson v. New Mexico State Racing Comm'n*, 80 N.M. 200, 453 P.2d 370 (1969).

Denomination of pleading irrelevant since allegations and relief determine nature. - See same catchline in notes to 44-2-1 NMSA 1978.

If prohibition does not lie on facts then neither does mandamus. - Relator sought by writ of prohibition to restrain the district judge from granting a new trial in a workmen's compensation action on grounds of lack of jurisdiction under the act, and a motion to dismiss was sustained, under the same facts where prohibition will not lie, mandamus will not lie. *State ex rel. Gallegos v. MacPherson*, 63 N.M. 133, 314 P.2d 891 (1957).

If no jurisdictional question or injustice then writ not issued. - Where there was no jurisdictional question presented nor any showing that grave injustice would result if the case proceeded to trial, the matter was not one calling for the writ; and as the alternative writ of prohibition had been improvidently issued, it was thereby discharged. *Baca v. Burks*, 81 N.M. 376, 467 P.2d 392 (1970).

Law reviews. - For comment, "Civil Procedure - Dismissal and Nonsuit - Mandamus," see 4 Nat. Resources J. 413 (1964).

For article, "Mandamus in New Mexico," see 4 N.M.L. Rev. 155 (1974).

For note, "Mandamus Proceedings Against Public Officials: State of New Mexico ex rel. Bird v. Apodaca," see 9 N.M.L. Rev. 195 (1978-79).

For article, "Habeas Corpus in New Mexico," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 291 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus §§ 4, 63 to 93.

Mandamus to compel construction or repair of school buildings, 1 A.L.R. 1559.

Election of remedies as between mandamus and an action for damages, 1 A.L.R. 1698.

Mandamus to compel court to assume or exercise jurisdiction where it has erroneously dismissed the cause or refused to proceed on the ground of supposed lack of jurisdiction, 4 A.L.R. 582; 82 A.L.R. 1163.

Mandamus to compel a court to take jurisdiction of cause that it has erroneously dismissed for supposed insufficiency or lack of service of process, 4 A.L.R. 610.

Inadequacy of remedy by appeal or writ of error as affecting right to mandamus to inferior court, 4 A.L.R. 632.

Mandamus to compel a court to reinstate or proceed with the hearing of an appeal that it has erroneously dismissed, 4 A.L.R. 655.

Salary of public officer or employee, mandamus to compel payment of, 5 A.L.R. 572.

Mandamus to compel grant of diploma or other evidence of pupil's completion of course, 6 A.L.R. 1533.

Mandamus as proper remedy to compel payment of soldier's bounty, 13 A.L.R. 604; 22 A.L.R.2d 1134.

Mandamus to compel performance of duties after resignation of officer, 19 A.L.R. 48.

Officer's liability to penalty, fine or imprisonment as affecting right to mandamus to enforce performance of public duty by him, 19 A.L.R. 1382.

Partner's right to maintain mandamus against copartners, 21 A.L.R. 129.

Mandamus to enforce stockholders' right to inspect books and records, 22 A.L.R. 43; 43 A.L.R. 786; 80 A.L.R. 1517; 174 A.L.R. 291.

Unfitness as affecting right to restoration by mandamus to office from which one has been illegally removed, 36 A.L.R. 508.

Action or suit as abating mandamus proceeding or vice versa, 37 A.L.R. 1432.

Mandamus to compel enrollment or restoration of pupil in state school or university, 39 A.L.R. 1019.

Mandamus to compel court or judge to require witness to testify, 41 A.L.R. 436.

Mandamus against municipality to compel improvement or repair of street or highway, 46 A.L.R. 257.

Mandamus to compel legislature to make apportionment of representatives or election districts, 46 A.L.R. 964.

Mandamus as remedy for interference with right-of-way, 47 A.L.R. 557.

Mandamus to compel institution of proceedings to oust public officer, 51 A.L.R. 561.

Mandamus as a remedy for exclusion of eligible class or classes of persons from jury list, 52 A.L.R. 928.

Remedy by mandamus of creditor against officer who fails to levy under execution, 57 A.L.R. 836.

Mandamus to compel collection of taxes, 58 A.L.R. 117.

Mandamus as remedy delay in bringing accused to trial or to retrial after reversal, 58 A.L.R. 1510.

Enforceability of right to inspect public records by mandamus, 60 A.L.R. 1356; 169

A.L.R. 653.

Failure properly to index conveyance or mortgage of realty as affecting constructive notice, 63 A.L.R. 1057.

Mandamus to compel general course of conduct or performance of continuing duty or series of acts, 64 A.L.R. 975.

Mandamus to prevent records clerk from continuing to permit use of his office by abstract company, 80 A.L.R. 784.

Mandamus to compel consideration, acceptance or rejection of bids for public contract, 80 A.L.R. 1382.

Mandamus to compel appropriation for payment of salary of public officer or employee, 81 A.L.R. 1253.

Mandamus to compel consideration, allowance or payment of claim under workmen's compensation acts, 82 A.L.R. 1073.

Mandamus to compel court to assume jurisdiction where it has erroneously refused to proceed on ground of lack of jurisdiction, 82 A.L.R. 1163.

Mandamus as proper remedy to compel service by public utility, 83 A.L.R. 947.

Mandamus to compel service by telephone or telegraph company, 83 A.L.R. 950.

Mandamus to put one in possession of office, title to which is in dispute, 84 A.L.R. 1114; 136 A.L.R. 1340.

Right of several having interests to join as relators in mandamus proceedings, 87 A.L.R. 528.

Right to mandamus to compel full payment of claim when fund out of which obligation is payable is insufficient to pay all obligations of equal dignity, 90 A.L.R. 717.

Mandamus to compel official to approve bond proffered in legal proceedings, 92 A.L.R. 1211.

Mandamus as a proper remedy for return of a tax illegally or erroneously exacted, 93 A.L.R. 585.

Mandamus to compel delivery of papers and records to corporation, 93 A.L.R. 1061.

Mandamus to enforce payment of special assessment against public property, 95 A.L.R. 700.

Mandamus to restore license as proper remedy where professional license has been wrongfully revoked, 95 A.L.R. 1424.

Mandamus as remedy for purging of registration list, 96 A.L.R. 1050.

Mandamus to compel payment of state, county, municipal or quasi-municipal corporation warrant, 98 A.L.R. 442.

Mandamus by creditor of corporation to reach fund or securities deposited with state official as security for corporate obligations, 101 A.L.R. 500.

Change of incumbent of office or of personnel of board or other official body as affecting mandamus proceeding previously commenced, 102 A.L.R. 943.

Mandamus to compel performance of public or ministerial duty, 105 A.L.R. 1124.

Determination of canvassing board or election official as regards counting or exclusion of ballots as subject of review by mandamus, 107 A.L.R. 618.

Right of holder of license from public to question propriety of issuing license to other persons, 109 A.L.R. 1259.

Court's control over mandamus as means of avoiding enforcement of strict legal right, to detriment of the public, 113 A.L.R. 209.

Mandamus to compel action regarding free transportation of school pupils, 118 A.L.R. 818.

Mandamus as taxpayer's remedy in respect of valuation of property for taxation, 131 A.L.R. 360.

Mandamus to members or officer of legislature, 136 A.L.R. 667.

Mandamus against unincorporated association or its officers, 137 A.L.R. 311.

Mandamus to compel reinstatement of suspended or expelled members of labor union, 141 A.L.R. 617.

Right to go behind money judgment against public body in mandamus proceeding to enforce it, 155 A.L.R. 464.

Mandamus as subject to statute of limitations, 155 A.L.R. 1144.

Remedies for exclusion of eligible class of persons from jury list in civil case, 166 A.L.R. 1422.

Private rights and remedies to enforce right based on civil rights statute, 171 A.L.R. 920.

Legislature's express denial of right of appeal as affecting right to review on the merits by certiorari or mandamus, 174 A.L.R. 194.

Default as condition of right to compel governmental body to pay, or make provision for payment of, its obligations, 175 A.L.R. 648.

Requiring successor judge to generalize findings or decision of predecessor, 4 A.L.R.2d 884.

Relief for expulsion from social club, 20 A.L.R.2d 393.

Relief for suspension or expulsion from a church or religious society, 20 A.L.R.2d 494.

Relief for expulsion from professional association, 20 A.L.R.2d 570.

Corporation as necessary or proper party defendant in proceedings to determine validity of election or appointment of corporate director or officer, 21 A.L.R.2d 1048.

Adequacy of remedy at law for refusal of corporation or its agent to register or effectuate transfer of stock, 22 A.L.R.2d 142.

Mandamus to compel judge or other officer to grant accused bail or to accept proffered sureties, 23 A.L.R.2d 803.

Compelling municipal officials to enforce zoning regulations, 35 A.L.R.2d 1135.

Remedy by appeal or writ of error as affecting mandamus to enforce right to jury trial, 41 A.L.R.2d 780.

Compelling assertedly disqualified judge to excuse self or to certify his disqualification, 45 A.L.R.2d 937.

Venue of mandamus proceeding against public officer, 48 A.L.R.2d 447.

Compelling holding of stockholders' meetings, 48 A.L.R.2d 615.

Private person's right to institute mandamus to compel a magistrate or other appropriate official to issue a warrant, or the like, for an arrest, 49 A.L.R.2d 1285.

Right of parents to mandamus against school officials with respect to names of children, 53 A.L.R.2d 923.

Enforcing rights of noncivil service public employee, with respect to discharge, under state veterans' tenure statute, 58 A.L.R.2d 1005.

For promotion of convenience of witnesses and ends of justice, 74 A.L.R.2d 38.

Availability of mandamus to review order of reference to master or auditor, 76 A.L.R.2d 1120.

Remedy to review verdict at coroner's inquest, 78 A.L.R.2d 1218.

Compelling admission to membership in professional associations, 89 A.L.R.2d 967.
Compelling ascertainment of compensation for property taken or for injuries inflicted under power of eminent domain, 91 A.L.R.2d 991.

Remedy to review ruling on change of venue in civil case, 93 A.L.R.2d 802.

Mandamus to compel discovery proceedings, 95 A.L.R.2d 1229.

Absentee Voters' Laws, 97 A.L.R.2d 340.

Mandamus to compel disciplinary investigation or action against physician or attorney, 33 A.L.R.3d 1429.

Mandamus to protect charitable or eleemosynary corporation against use of same or similar name by another corporation, 37 A.L.R.3d 277.

55 C.J.S. Mandamus §§ 51 to 239.

II. Purpose of Section.

A. In General.

Mandamus is a summary and specific remedy to enforce performance of a duty incident to an existing right, in cases in which, without such appropriate redress, serious injustice would occur. It is a recognized process to maintain the prima facie title to an office, and it is not within its purview to determine the legality of such claim. *Conklin v. Cunningham*, 7 N.M. 445, 38 P. 170 (1894).

For mandamus to lie there must be clear legal right sought to be enforced, and where college professor's claimed tenure was not as a result of a positive provision of law, no such clear legal right existed. *Lease v. Board of Regents*, 83 N.M. 781, 498 P.2d 310 (1972).

Purpose of mandamus is to compel performance of ministerial duty which one charged with its performance has refused to perform. *State ex rel. Reynolds v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 71 N.M. 194, 376 P.2d 976 (1962).

Mandamus lies to compel official's performance. - It is the general rule that mandamus will lie to compel the performance by a public body or official of a clear, plain duty. 1961-62 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 61-37.

Rights may not be adjudicated between parties by mandamus. - It is only a method of enforcing an existing right. *State ex rel. State Hwy. Comm'n v. Quesenberry*, 72 N.M. 291, 383 P.2d 255 (1963).

Writ only lies where duty clear and indisputable. - Mandamus lies to compel the performance of a statutory duty only when it is clear and indisputable. *Regents of Agrl. College v. Vaughn*, 12 N.M. 333, 78 P. 51 (1904).

Mandamus lies at request of person beneficially interested to compel the performance of an affirmative act by another where the duty to perform the act is clearly enjoined by law and where there is no other plain, speedy and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. *El Dorado at Santa Fe, Inc. v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 89 N.M. 313, 551 P.2d 1360 (1976).

Writ may be used to question constitutionality. - Mandamus may not be used to control judicial discretion, but in the proper case, mandamus may be used to question the constitutionality of a state statute. *Montoya v. Blackhurst*, 84 N.M. 91, 500 P.2d 176 (1972).

Mandamus affords proper remedy against ex official by de facto officer having prima facie right to obtain possession of the books, papers and other property of the office, and a pretended retention of the office by the late occupant will not justify him in withholding such property, with a view to compel resort to information in the nature of quo warranto by a party possessing the prima facie title. *Conklin v. Cunningham*, 7 N.M. 445, 38 P. 170 (1894).

One who has prima facie title to office may compel delivery to himself of the property and paraphernalia of the office by mandamus; the question of actual or ultimate title to the office must be reserved for another proceeding. *Eldodt v. Territory ex rel. Vaughn*, 10 N.M. 141, 61 P. 105 (1900).

B. Judicial Acts.

Mandamus is proper remedy to compel district court to take action or perform duties as required by legislative enactments. *State ex rel. Maloney v. Neal*, 80 N.M. 460, 457 P.2d 708 (1969).

Simple ministerial task of setting case down for jury trial is an act which may be compelled by writ of mandamus. *State ex rel. Cardenas v. Swope*, 58 N.M. 296, 270 P.2d 708 (1954).

Remedy for erroneous refusal of appeal or supersedeas is mandamus and not by writ of error. *Albright v. Territory ex rel. Sandoval*, 13 N.M. 64, 79 P. 719 (1905), appeal dismissed, 200 U.S. 9, 26 S. Ct. 210, 50 L. Ed. 346 (1906); *Gutierrez v. Territory ex rel. Curran*, 13 N.M. 30, 79 P. 299 (1905), appeal dismissed, 202 U.S. 614, 26 S. Ct. 766, 50 L. Ed. 1171 (1906).

Writ lies to compel fixing amount of supersedeas bond. - Mandamus will be granted to command the trial court to fix the amount of the supersedeas bond, where an order and judgment granting a mandatory injunction have been appealed. *State ex rel. Martinez v. Holloman*, 25 N.M. 117, 177 P. 741 (1918).

C. Acts by Public Officials.

Mandamus is proper remedy to compel performance of official act by a public officer. *City of Santa Rosa v. Jaramillo*, 85 N.M. 747, 517 P.2d 69 (1973).

Governor's duty under primary election law to issue proclamation was mandatory and mandamus was properly granted to compel the governor to specify in his proclamation the boundaries of the district making up the office of county commissioner and terms of that office. *State ex rel. Robinson v. King*, 86 N.M. 231, 522 P.2d 83 (1974).

Writ lies to contest failure to certify nominees. - Mandamus is a proper action to contest the validity of the secretary of state's action in failing to certify a party's nominees. *State ex rel. Chavez v. Evans*, 79 N.M. 578, 446 P.2d 445 (1968).

Mandamus compelling payment serves function of writ of execution. - Mandamus is one of the remedies and often the only one available to compel a governmental body to pay a money judgment. Mandamus issued to enforce payment of a money judgment against a governmental agency is only ancillary to and in aid of the judgment, and serves the same purpose as a writ of execution. *State ex rel. State Hwy. Comm'n v. Quesenberry*, 72 N.M. 291, 383 P.2d 255 (1963).

Writ lies where board has duty and mistakes its power. - Where appeal has been taken from the granting of an alternative writ of mandamus, and the answer shows that the respondent had failed to perform a clear legal duty, and was mistaken as to its power, and that it erroneously alleged that relator had other legal remedy, this court will not interfere, and a peremptory writ will issue. *State ex rel. Thompson v. Beall*, 37 N.M. 72, 18 P.2d 249 (1932).

Another's license not revoked for commercial advantages. - Commercial advantages, which the holder of a retail liquor license might gain by elimination of competition of another holder of a license, were too illusive and uncertain to entitle it to maintain mandamus proceedings, as a person enforcing special interest or private right, to compel revocation of the license of another. *Ruidoso State Bank v. Brumlow*, 81 N.M. 379, 467 P.2d 395 (1970), overruled on other grounds, *De Vargas Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Campbell*, 87 N.M. 469, 535 P.2d 1320 (1975).

Mandamus lies to compel board of county commissioners to perform a duty required by statute. *Codlin v. Kohlhousen*, 9 N.M. 565, 58 P. 499 (1899), appeal dismissed, 181 U.S. 151, 21 S. Ct. 584, 45 L. Ed. 793 (1901).

To compel canvass of votes. - A board of canvassers may be compelled by mandamus to canvass votes, and to direct how they shall be returned and in whose favor an election certificate shall be issued. *In re Sloan*, 5 N.M. 590, 25 P. 930 (1891); *Territory ex rel. Lewis v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 5 N.M. 1, 16 P. 855 (1888).

And to compel tax levy. - A writ of mandamus is properly directed to the mayor and city council to compel a tax levy. Territory ex rel. Parker v. Mayor of Socorro, 12 N.M. 177, 76 P. 283 (1904).

Writ remedy to teacher for refusal to rehire. - A teacher's remedy for refusal of the local school board to give her a hearing and a statement of reasons for its refusal to rehire her was to pursue mandamus. The jurisdiction of the state board is limited to review of decisions of the local school board made after an informal hearing, and the jurisdiction of the court of appeals is limited to review of decisions of the state board. Bertrand v. New Mexico State Bd. of Educ., 88 N.M. 611, 544 P.2d 1176 (Ct. App. 1975), cert. denied, 89 N.M. 5, 546 P.2d 70 (1976).

To compel grievance proceeding under city merit system. - City may be compelled to hold a grievance proceeding under a city merit system, where there was evidence that the city officials had failed in their duty to provide a required remedy, and, the alternative, a suit in contract, would not have been plain, speedy, or adequate. Lovato v. City of Albuquerque, 106 N.M. 287, 742 P.2d 499 (1987).

Writ cannot make collateral attack on judgment. - Where judgments have been rendered against a county on certain of its bonds, attack may not be made on their validity by mandamus to compel payment. Territory ex rel. Coler v. Board of County Comm'rs, 14 N.M. 134, 89 P. 252 (1907), aff'd, 215 U.S. 296, 30 S. Ct. 111, 54 L. Ed. 202 (1909).

III. Type of Duty.

A. Ministerial.

Writ does not lie unless specially enjoined upon warden. - Plaintiff could not prevail in petition for writ of mandamus where the act sought to be compelled was not one specially enjoined by law upon the warden. Apodaca v. Rodriguez, 84 N.M. 338, 503 P.2d 318 (1972).

Act to be compelled by mandamus must be ministerial, that is, an act or thing which the public official is required to perform by direction of law upon a given state of facts being shown to exist, regardless of his own opinion as to the propriety or impropriety of doing the act in the particular case. El Dorado at Santa Fe, Inc. v. Board of County Comm'rs, 89 N.M. 313, 551 P.2d 1360 (1976).

A ministerial act, as applied to a public officer, is an act or thing which he is required to perform by direction of law upon a given state of facts being shown to exist, regardless of his own opinion as to the propriety or impropriety of doing the act in the particular case. Sender v. Montoya, 73 N.M. 287, 387 P.2d 860 (1963); State ex rel. Reynolds v. Board of County Comm'rs, 71 N.M. 194, 376 P.2d 976 (1962).

Writ lies to compel acts committed to official's discretion. - Acts and the duties under them are no less ministerial because the public official, upon whom the duty is enjoined, may have to satisfy himself as to the existence of facts necessary to require his action. Where he refuses to act after such a determination is made, mandamus is the proper remedy, and where he refuses or delays, mandamus will issue to compel acts committed to his discretion if the law requires him to act one way or another. *El Dorado at Santa Fe, Inc. v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 89 N.M. 313, 551 P.2d 1360 (1976).

And to compel particular act upon shown facts. - While mandamus will not lie to correct or control the judgment or discretion of a public officer in matters committed to his care in the ordinary discharge of his duties, it will lie to compel the performance of mere ministerial acts or duties imposed by law upon a public officer to do a particular act or thing upon the existence of certain facts or conditions being shown, even though the officer be required to exercise judgment before acting. *State ex rel. Reynolds v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 71 N.M. 194, 376 P.2d 976 (1962).

Mandamus lies to compel judicial officer or court to perform an act or duty which is ministerial and does not include the exercise of discretion. Likewise, it will lie to require a court to perform its judicial duties, but not to do so in any particular way. *State ex rel. Maloney v. Neal*, 80 N.M. 460, 457 P.2d 708 (1969).

County commissioners' duties as to subdivisions formerly only ministerial. - Before the passage of the 1973 New Mexico Subdivision Act (47-5-9, 47-6-1 to 47-6-29 NMSA 1978), a board of county commissioners had nothing to do but the ministerial act of endorsing its approval on plats which complied with all statutory requirements for rural subdivisions, and mandamus was a proper remedy when it refused to do so. *El Dorado at Santa Fe, Inc. v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 89 N.M. 313, 551 P.2d 1360 (1976).

B. Discretionary.

Mandamus will not direct performance of particular act from among two or more allowed alternatives. *El Dorado at Santa Fe, Inc. v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 89 N.M. 313, 551 P.2d 1360 (1976).

Discretion in performing an act arises when it may be performed in one of two or more ways, either of which would be lawful, and where it is left to the will or judgment of the performer to determine in which way it should be performed, but when a positive duty is enjoined and there is but one way in which it can be performed lawfully, then there is no discretion. *State ex rel. Reynolds v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 71 N.M. 194, 376 P.2d 976 (1962).

Where discretion is as to existence of facts entitling relator to the thing demanded, if facts are clearly proved or admitted, mandamus will lie to compel action according to

law, for in such case the act to be done becomes purely ministerial and the duty to perform is absolute. *City of Santa Rosa v. Jaramillo*, 85 N.M. 747, 517 P.2d 69 (1973).

Writ lies to compel act even if exercising judgment required. - While mandamus will not lie to correct or control the judgment or discretion of a public officer in matters committed to his care in the ordinary discharge of his duties, it is nevertheless well established that mandamus will lie to compel the performance of mere ministerial acts or duties imposed by law upon a public officer to do a particular act or thing upon the existence of certain facts or conditions being shown, even though the officer be required to exercise judgment before acting. *Sender v. Montoya*, 73 N.M. 287, 387 P.2d 860 (1963).

Mandamus is not available to control judicial discretion unless there is a clear abuse of that discretion, or unless such action would prevent the doing of useless things. *State ex rel. Peters v. McIntosh*, 80 N.M. 496, 458 P.2d 222 (1969).

Mandamus not available to limit prosecutorial discretion. - Although a prosecutor is required to present direct exculpatory evidence to the grand jury, he is invested with wide discretion as to the selection and presentation of evidence. Mandamus will not lie where the effect of its issuance would be to improperly limit the scope of the state's prosecutorial discretion. *Kerpan v. Sandoval County Dist. Att'ys Office*, 106 N.M. 764, 750 P.2d 464 (Ct. App. 1988).

Where officials have discretion, no clear legal duty exists. - Mandamus is a remedy for the violation of a clear legal duty, and where no such legal duty is required, as where village officials may exercise discretion, it follows that it would be improvident to issue the writ. *State ex rel. Sun Co. v. Vigil*, 74 N.M. 766, 398 P.2d 987 (1965).

No basis for writ if official has discretion. - Under 42-1-23 NMSA 1978, if the state highway commission has a clear legal duty to sell to the property owner, the writ of mandamus may compel the discharge of the duty, but if there is discretion to sell, rather than a clear legal duty to do so, there is no basis for the writ. *State ex rel. State Hwy. Comm'n v. Clark*, 79 N.M. 29, 439 P.2d 547 (1968).

§ 44-2-5. [Adequate remedy at law; writ will not issue; who may obtain writ.]

The writ shall not issue in any case where there is a plain, speedy and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. It shall issue on the information of the party beneficially interested.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 39; C.L. 1884, § 1994; C.L. 1897, § 2762; Code 1915, § 3414; C.S. 1929, § 86-104; 1941 Comp., § 26-105; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-5.

- I. General Consideration.
- II. Plain and Adequate.
- III. Speedy.
- IV. Beneficially Interested.

I. General Consideration.

Mandamus can only be resorted to when other remedies fail. *State ex rel. Sweeney v. Second Judicial Dist.*, 17 N.M. 282, 127 P. 23 (1912).

Municipality without right to appeal may enforce rights by mandamus. - When a municipality is not given a right to appeal and thus has no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law to enforce its rights to protect the health, safety, welfare and morals of its residents, these rights may be enforced by mandamus. *City of Santa Rosa v. Jaramillo*, 85 N.M. 747, 517 P.2d 69 (1973).

But where remedy at law exists writ will not lie. - As respondents had a plain, speedy and adequate remedy at law from the order denying their motion to quash the writs of garnishment, to wit, an appeal by trial de novo therefrom to the district court, mandamus did not lie to correct the claimed error by respondent, if in fact error was committed. *Alfred v. Anderson*, 86 N.M. 227, 522 P.2d 79 (1974).

Writ lies if no remedy in ordinary course of law. - Refusal of state corporation commission to draw a voucher for the salary of an employee of the commission entitles him to resort to the remedy of mandamus, as the ordinary course of law does not afford a plain, speedy and adequate remedy. *State ex rel. Stephens v. SCC*, 25 N.M. 32, 176 P. 866 (1918).

Writ may be maintained if plain ministerial duty required. - Where a teacher, by positive provision of law, has a fixed tenure of office, or can be removed only in a certain prescribed manner, and where consequently it is the plain ministerial duty to retain him, mandamus can be maintained. Mandamus is not an available remedy for enforcement of contract rights because there is another adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law, in the form of an action for damages. *State ex rel. Sittler v. Board of Educ.*, 18 N.M. 183, 135 P. 96 (1913).

Writ can compel canvass of election returns. - Under this section, an information was properly filed as the basis of proceeding for writ of mandamus to compel board of county commissioners to canvass election returns. *Territory ex rel. Lewis v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 5 N.M. (Gild., E.W.S. ed.) 1, 16 P. 855 (1888).

Alternative writ and answer only pleadings considered. - The only pleadings to be considered on a petition for the writ are the alternative writ and the answer thereto. *Schreiber v. Baca*, 58 N.M. 766, 276 P.2d 902 (1954).

The petition for the writ becomes functus officio when granted. *Schreiber v. Baca*, 58 N.M. 766, 276 P.2d 902 (1954).

Law reviews. - For comment on *Sender v. Montoya*, 73 N.M. 287, 387 P.2d 860 (1963), see 4 Nat. Resources J. 413 (1964).

For article, "Prisoners Are People," see 10 Nat. Resources J. 869 (1970).

For article, "Mandamus in New Mexico," see 4 N.M.L. Rev. 155 (1974).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus §§ 46 to 58. Adequacy of remedy by indictment so as to bar mandamus to compel improvement or repair of highway or bridge, 46 A.L.R. 267.

Existence of other remedy as affecting right to mandamus to compel return of tax illegally or erroneously exacted, 93 A.L.R. 589.

Mandamus to compel payment of state, county, municipal or quasi-municipal corporation warrants as affected by remedy at law, 98 A.L.R. 449.

55 C.J.S. Mandamus § 17.

II. Plain and Adequate.

Writ cannot lie where adequate law or appeal remedy exists. - Mandamus will not lie where there exists a plain, speedy and adequate remedy at law; nor will it lie where there is an adequate remedy by appeal. *Montoya v. Blackhurst*, 84 N.M. 91, 500 P.2d 176 (1972).

Nor will writ enforce contract where adequate remedy exists. - Mandamus will not issue to enforce a contract, even though a legally enforceable contract exists, if there is an adequate remedy at law. *Shepard v. Board of Educ.*, 81 N.M. 585, 470 P.2d 306 (1970).

Also writ cannot lie until administrative remedies exhausted. - Mandamus is a proper remedy only after a petitioner has exhausted his administrative remedies. *Shepard v. Board of Educ.*, 81 N.M. 585, 470 P.2d 306 (1970).

Inadequacy not absence determines propriety of writ. - It is the inadequacy, and not the mere absence, of all other legal remedies, and the danger of a failure of justice without it, that must usually determine the propriety of a writ of mandamus; and it is not excluded by other remedies, which are not adequate to secure the specific relief needed, nor by the existence of a specific remedy in equity. *Conklin v. Cunningham*, 7 N.M. 445, 38 P. 170 (1894).

Writ where alternative remedy insufficient. - City may be compelled to hold a grievance proceeding under a city merit system, where there was evidence that the city officials had failed in their duty to provide a required remedy, and, the alternative, a suit in contract, would not have been plain, speedy, or adequate. *Lovato v. City of Albuquerque*, 106 N.M. 287, 742 P.2d 499 (1987).

Declaratory judgment not intended as substitute for mandamus. - Declaratory judgment actions are not intended to provide a substitute for other available actions, such as mandamus. A mandamus will not be denied on the ground that the plaintiff did not bring a declaratory judgment action. *City of Albuquerque v. Ryon*, 106 N.M. 600, 747 P.2d 246 (1987).

Mandamus will not lie where adequate remedy by appeal, or writ of error exists. *State ex rel. Sweeney v. Second Judicial Dist.*, 17 N.M. 282, 127 P. 23 (1912).

Appeal must also be taken from administrative decisions. - Mandamus will not lie when the relator has failed to pursue a statutory right to appeal to district court from an administrative decision. *Birido v. Rodriguez*, 84 N.M. 207, 501 P.2d 195 (1972).

Erroneous sentence must also be appealed. - Where defendant received erroneous sentence upon conviction of forgery, but failed to exercise right of appeal, mandamus would not lie to compel parole board to treat his sentence as if correct. *State Bd. of Parole v. Lane*, 63 N.M. 105, 314 P.2d 602 (1957).

Cannot compel signing bill of exception after appeal's return date. - Mandamus will not lie to compel a district judge to sign and settle a bill of exceptions not tendered until after the return day of appeal. *State ex rel. Divelbiss v. Reynolds*, 17 N.M. 662, 132 P. 249 (1913).

Liquor license applicant's remedy after division's final decision was appeal. - Where a letter from division of liquor control clearly shows that the application had been considered and in fact that the application cannot be processed because the quota of one license to each 2000 people has been more than filled in Rio Arriba county, there can be no doubt this amounted to a final decision on division's part to refuse the application. A decision is a determination arrived at after consideration, an opinion formed, or a course of action decided upon. The applicant's remedy upon being advised of the decision was by appeal to the district court of Santa Fe county as expressly provided by former 60-7-20 NMSA 1978. It follows that the district court erred in entering its judgment ordering the issuance of a peremptory writ of mandamus. *Armijo v. Armijo*, 77 N.M. 742, 427 P.2d 258 (1967).

Teacher's failure to follow statutory remedy negated his right to proceed by mandamus. *Sanchez v. Board of Educ.*, 68 N.M. 440, 362 P.2d 979 (1961).

Adequate law remedy exists to redress public lands commissioner's acts. - Section 19-7-67 NMSA 1978 provides an adequate remedy at law for anyone who is aggrieved by

the action of the commissioner of public lands and therefore, mandamus does not lie to compel the duties alleged to be due. *Andrews v. Walker*, 60 N.M. 69, 287 P.2d 423 (1955).

Writ lies to enforce provisions of judgment in condemnation proceeding. - Rule that mandamus will not issue to enforce contract rights "because there is another adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, in the form of an action for damages" was not applicable when property owner sought mandamus to enforce provisions of a judgment in a condemnation proceeding because money damages were not an adequate remedy in actions for specific performance of land sales contract; and "there can be no monetary substitute for the precise land bargained for." *State ex rel. State Hwy. Comm'n v. Clark*, 79 N.M. 29, 439 P.2d 547 (1968).

Administrative duties must be exhausted. - Mandamus does not lie when the relator has failed to exhaust an adequate administrative remedy provided by statute. *Birido v. Rodriguez*, 84 N.M. 207, 501 P.2d 195 (1972).

Writ cannot lie where administrative remedies unexhausted and pleadings deficient. - Where the pleading was patently deficient and where there was a failure to exhaust administrative remedies, the trial court did not err in dismissing plaintiff's mandamus claim sua sponte and without appointment of counsel. *Orrs v. Rodriguez*, 84 N.M. 355, 503 P.2d 335 (Ct. App. 1972).

III. Speedy.

Writ lies where early constitutionality decision of importance. - Mandamus was a proper remedy by which the petitioner could attack the constitutionality of statute in view of the possible inadequacy of other remedies and the necessity of an early decision on question of great public importance. *Thompson v. Legislative Audit Comm'n*, 79 N.M. 693, 448 P.2d 799 (1968).

Mandamus will lie to determine proper place of trial, before trial, where great delay and expense would result from pursuing an appeal and where a change in venue was made without authority. *State ex rel. Cardenas v. Swope*, 58 N.M. 296, 270 P.2d 708 (1954).

Also lies where combination of facets of litigation cause delay. - The ordinary delays attendant to a somewhat involved trial would not of itself justify mandamus nor would the fact that the petitioner does not have the benefit of a replevin bond although this is a circumstance which must be considered in connection with the delays of a trial and subsequent appeal. It is more the combination of all the various facets of the litigation which makes it apparent that to refuse the writ "would result in needless expense and delay" and therefore the ordinary remedy by appeal is inadequate here. *Sender v. Montoya*, 73 N.M. 287, 387 P.2d 860 (1963).

IV. Beneficially Interested.

Mandamus lies at request of person beneficially interested to compel the performance of an affirmative act by another where the duty to perform the act is clearly enjoined by law and where there is no other plain, speedy and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. *El Dorado at Santa Fe, Inc. v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 89 N.M. 313, 551 P.2d 1360 (1976).

City is "beneficially interested" in suit to compel its treasurer to deposit the money in his hands belonging to it in a bank designated by ordinance, from which it would receive interest. *Territory ex rel. City of Albuquerque v. Matson*, 16 N.M. 135, 113 P. 816 (1911).

Citizen may apply to enforce performance of public duty. - As a general rule, mandamus may issue to enforce the performance of a public duty by public officers not due to the government itself as such, upon application of any citizen whose rights are affected in common with those of the general public. *State ex rel. Burg v. City of Albuquerque*, 31 N.M. 576, 249 P. 242 (1926).

Taxpayer has no standing to enforce duty owed to public. - The university of New Mexico is a creature of the N.M. Const., art. XII, §§ 12, 13, augmented by 21-7-1 to 21-7-3 NMSA 1978, and the respondents owe their duties to the state of New Mexico, not to a private person. This being so, it follows that relator, though a taxpayer, has no standing to enforce by mandamus a duty owing to the public. *Womack v. Regents of Univ. of N.M.*, 82 N.M. 460, 483 P.2d 934 (1971).

State and not parents of victim interested in murder prosecution. - Discretion of appointed or elected public officials charged with criminal prosecution cannot be controlled by mandamus proceedings in murder prosecution since it is the state rather than parents of child who was killed which is the party beneficially interested in the prosecution. *State ex rel. Naramore v. Hensley*, 53 N.M. 308, 207 P.2d 529 (1949).

§ 44-2-6. [Contents of writ.]

The writ is either alternative or peremptory. The alternative writ shall state concisely the facts showing the obligation of the defendant to perform the act, and his omission to perform it, and command him, that immediately after the receipt of the writ, or at some other specified time, he do the act required to be performed, or show cause before the court out of which the writ issued, at a specified time and place, why he has not done so; and that he then and there return the writ with his certificate of having done as he is commanded. The peremptory writ shall be in a similar form, except that the words requiring the defendant to show cause why he has not done as commanded, shall be omitted.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 40; C.L. 1884, § 1995; C.L. 1897, § 2763; Code 1915, § 3415; C.S. 1929, § 86-105; 1941 Comp., § 26-106; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-6.

Cross-references. - As to writ and answer being only pleading allowed in mandamus proceeding, see 44-2-11 NMSA 1978.

Facts pleaded in same manner as in ordinary actions. - Allegations of fact in mandamus proceedings should be pleaded with the same certainty, no more and no less, as in ordinary actions. *State ex rel. Burg v. City of Albuquerque*, 31 N.M. 576, 249 P. 242 (1926).

Allegations of fact in application form no part of writ. - Allegations of fact in an application for alternative writ of mandamus form no part of the writ and ordinarily cannot be so considered in determining the legal sufficiency of the writ. *Mora County Bd. of Educ. v. Valdez*, 61 N.M. 361, 300 P.2d 943 (1956).

To entitle relator to writ of mandamus he must first show himself to be entitled legally to some right properly the subject of the writ, and that it is legally demandable from the person to whom the writ is directed; second, that the person to whom the writ is directed still has it in his power to perform the duty required; third, that whatever is required to be done by the said relator as a condition precedent to the right demanded must be shown affirmatively to have been done by him. *Territory ex rel. Gildersleeve v. Perea*, 6 N.M. 531, 30 P. 928 (1892), appeal dismissed, 163 U.S. 697, 16 S. Ct. 1207, 41 L. Ed. 307 (1896), overruled on other grounds, *Cavender v. Phillips*, 41 N.M. 235, 67 P.2d 250 (1937) (decided under former tax law).

Requirement that writ contain allegations of all facts necessary to authorize the relief sought applies with great reason to peremptory writs of mandamus issued in ex parte proceedings. *Mora County Bd. of Educ. v. Valdez*, 61 N.M. 361, 300 P.2d 943 (1956).

Requirements not met when no showing of obligation to act. - Compliance with the requirements of the statute which governs content of writs of mandamus was not had where there was no statement of facts showing respondent's obligation to perform any particular act, and the essential elements were not inferable from what is said in the petition. *Birido v. Rodriguez*, 84 N.M. 207, 501 P.2d 195 (1972).

Writ must allege facts necessary to authorize relief sought. - Once the proceeding is accepted as one in mandamus, then certain well-recognized rules emerge to control the consideration of the case. A most important one is that the case must be tried on the writ and answer. The complaint itself drops out of the picture and the writ must contain allegations of all facts necessary to authorize the relief sought. Furthermore, allegations in the writ should be made as in ordinary actions. Hence, the usual rules applicable in testing the sufficiency of a complaint in an ordinary civil action apply. The facts should be pleaded with the same certainty, neither more nor less. *Alfred v. Anderson*, 86 N.M. 227, 522 P.2d 79 (1974).

Appeal dismissed where required procedures in mandamus proceedings not followed. - Where procedures, required in mandamus proceedings, were not followed as no writ ever issued, and the order to show cause did not even closely approximate the requirements of a writ; none of the ordinary elements expected and required to be in a writ were found in the order; no issues were raised or presented at trial in the required manner, and, consequently, could not have been tested as to sufficiency according to ordinary rules of pleading, then an appellate court must dismiss the appeal. *Alfred v. Anderson*, 86 N.M. 227, 522 P.2d 79 (1974).

Erroneous dismissal contested without formal exception. - A judgment dismissing an action and quashing an alternative writ of mandamus, because of failure of the writ to comply with the requirements of this section, if erroneously entered and appearing in the record proper, is inherently and fatally defective, and may be contested in the supreme court without formal exception. *State ex rel. Burg v. City of Albuquerque*, 31 N.M. 576, 249 P. 242 (1926).

Writ not void because title to office incidentally involved. - In mandamus proceeding involving contempt for failure of an official to recognize one of rival claimants for county office, where the court had jurisdiction of the subject matter and the parties, the writ was not void because it involved incidentally the title to the office. *Delgado v. Chavez*, 5 N.M. 646, 25 P. 948, *aff'd sub nom In re Delgado*, 140 U.S. 586, 11 S. Ct. 874, 35 L. Ed. 578 (1891).

Law reviews. - For article, "Mandamus in New Mexico," see 4 N.M. L. Rev. 155 (1974).

For note, "Mandamus Proceedings Against Public Officials: State of New Mexico *ex rel. Bird v. Apodaca*," see 9 N.M.L. Rev. 195 (1978-79).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus §§ 427, 428, 477.
55 C.J.S. Mandamus §§ 317, 349.

§ 44-2-7. [When peremptory or alternative writs issued.]

When the right to require the performance of the act is clear, and it is apparent that no valid excuse can be given for not performing it, a peremptory mandamus may be allowed in the first instance; in all other cases the alternative writ shall be first issued.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 41; C.L. 1884, § 1996; C.L. 1897, § 2764; Code 1915, § 3416; C.S. 1929, § 86-106; 1941 Comp., § 26-107; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-7.

This section does not violate due process of law. *Board of Comm'rs v. District Court*, 29 N.M. 244, 223 P. 516 (1924).

Peremptory writ of mandamus may issue without a hearing. Territory ex rel. Coler v. Board of County Comm'rs, 14 N.M. 134, 89 P. 252 (1907), aff'd, 215 U.S. 296, 30 S. Ct. 111, 54 L. Ed. 202 (1909).

Demand is not necessary before bringing suit by mandamus to compel county commissioners to levy tax to satisfy judgments on county bonds, where it is clear the board does not intend to perform its duty. Territory ex rel. Coler v. Board of County Comm'rs, 14 N.M. 134, 89 P. 252 (1907), aff'd, 215 U.S. 296, 30 S. Ct. 111, 54 L. Ed. 202 (1909).

Peremptory writ issues in first instance only where right clear. - A peremptory writ of mandamus may issue in the first instance only where the right to require the performance of the act is clear, and it is apparent that no valid excuse can be given for not performing it. Mora County Bd. of Educ. v. Valdez, 61 N.M. 361, 300 P.2d 943 (1956).

Peremptory writ must contain all necessary facts that authorize relief. - Requirement that the writ contain allegations of all facts necessary to authorize the relief sought applies with great reason to peremptory writs of mandamus issued in ex parte proceedings. Mora County Bd. of Educ. v. Valdez, 61 N.M. 361, 300 P.2d 943 (1956).

And must show that no valid excuse can be given. - Under this section, a peremptory writ of mandamus issued in an ex parte proceeding must contain allegations of all facts necessary to show that the right to require performance of the act sought is clear and that no valid excuse can be given for not performing it. Rivera v. Nunn, 78 N.M. 208, 430 P.2d 102 (1967).

Once final judgment reached official's refusal to act unjustified. - Where the final judgment condemned the property and awarded damages to the condemnees, any refusal to act by the officers named would not be justified, because they would have no discretion but to comply with the judgment. State ex rel. State Hwy. Comm'n v. Quesenberry, 74 N.M. 30, 390 P.2d 273 (1964).

Peremptory writ may be issued to compel board of canvassers to count the votes and to issue a writ of election. Territory ex rel. Lewis v. Board of County Comm'rs, 5 N.M. (Gild., E.W.S. ed.) 1, 16 P. 855 (1888).

And writ may compel election certificate be issued to relator. - Where it appears that a board of canvassers have failed to count votes which should have been counted, and where, if such votes were counted, the relator would be elected, the court may, by peremptory writ of mandamus, direct the board of canvassers to count such votes, and to issue to relator a certificate of election. Territory ex rel. Lewis v. Board of County Comm'rs, 5 N.M. (Gild., E.W.S. ed.) 1, 16 P. 855 (1888).

Writ of prohibition issuing from state supreme court is final judgment within the meaning of 28 U.S.C.A. § 1257(3), and review of all proceedings concerning such should be

sought in the United States supreme court. *Gibner v. Oman*, 459 F. Supp. 436 (D.N.M. 1977).

Suggested action not sufficient predicate for compulsion by writ. - In a judicial decree a finding of fact not followed by a mandatory statement is of no effect. Thus the act sought to be enforced must be based upon the clear direction of the state to a local authority, and a bare finding of fact followed only by a recommendation of suggested action does not afford sufficient predicate for the compulsion of the act. *Mora County Bd. of Educ. v. Valdez*, 61 N.M. 361, 300 P.2d 943 (1956).

Act recommended by superior authority not compelled by peremptory writ. - The performance of an act which is merely recommended by a superior authority is not of such character that it may be compelled by the issuance of peremptory writ of mandamus. *Mora County Bd. of Educ. v. Valdez*, 61 N.M. 361, 300 P.2d 943 (1956).

Fact issues which go to basis of writ are defense. - In a mandamus proceeding brought by employees of a city to collect compensation due them, issues of fact as to whether petitioners were in fact city employees, whether they had performed services, and the amount of pay, if any, to which they were entitled, are all questions which could form the basis of a legal defense to the issuance of a writ of mandamus. *Rivera v. Nunn*, 78 N.M. 208, 430 P.2d 102 (1967).

District court, proceeding under this section, has jurisdiction to decide whether the case is one in which a peremptory writ is authorized or not. *Board of Comm'rs v. District Court*, 29 N.M. 244, 223 P. 516 (1924).

Order making writ final neither final judgment nor interlocutory decision. - Mandamus, as issued in a condemnation case to enforce a money judgment against the highway commission, was neither a prerogative writ nor a new suit, and the order making the writ permanent was neither a final judgment nor an interlocutory judgment, order or decision within the meaning of rules governing appeals. *State ex rel. State Hwy. Comm'n v. Quesenberry*, 72 N.M. 291, 383 P.2d 255 (1963).

Law reviews. - For article, "Prisoners Are People," see 10 *Nat. Resources J.* 869 (1970).

For article, "Mandamus in New Mexico," see 4 *N.M. L. Rev.* 155 (1974).

For note, "Mandamus Proceedings Against Public Officials: State of New Mexico ex rel. *Bird v. Apodaca*," see 9 *N.M.L. Rev.* 195 (1978-79).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 *Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus* § 476.
Right to, and necessity of, amendment of alternative writ of mandamus to conform to peremptory writ, 100 *A.L.R.* 404.
Provisional or alternative writ or order to show cause as condition of granting

peremptory or absolute writ, 116 A.L.R. 659.
55 C.J.S. Mandamus § 344.

§ 44-2-8. [Allowance of writ; return day; service.]

The court or judge, by an indorsement on the writ, shall allow the same, designate the return day thereof and direct the manner of service.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 42; C.L. 1884, § 1997; C.L. 1897, § 2765; Code 1915, § 3417; C.S. 1929, § 86-107; 1941 Comp., § 26-108; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-8.

Law reviews. - For article, "Mandamus in New Mexico," see 4 N.M. L. Rev. 155 (1974).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus §§ 411, 428, 480.
55 C.J.S. Mandamus §§ 319, 321, 350, 351.

§ 44-2-9. [Answer to writ.]

On the return day of the alternative writ, or such further day as the court allows, the party on whom the writ is served may show cause by answer, made in the same manner as an answer to a complaint in civil action.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 43; C.L. 1884, § 1998; C.L. 1897, § 2766; Code 1915, § 3418; C.S. 1929, § 86-108; 1941 Comp., § 26-109; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-9.

Cross-references. - As to answers generally, see Rules 1-008 and 1-012 SCRA 1986.

Where answer requests court to invoke judgment respondent submits to court. - In a mandamus proceeding to compel board of county commissioners to canvass election returns of a certain precinct where respondents requested the court to inspect the evidence offered with their answer, and bring into court all the returns, certificates, poll books and ballot box, and invoke its judgment as to the legal sufficiency to justify the action of the board, such action on their part is a submission to the court, and they cannot insist on a jury trial nor will they be heard to object that there is no evidence, upon the issue of facts raised by their answer, to support the judgment of the court below in awarding a peremptory writ. Territory ex rel. Lewis v. Board of County Comm'rs, 5 N.M. (Gild., E.W.S. ed.) 1, 16 P. 855 (1888).

Time to answer may be extended and amendments allowed. - While office of mandamus is to afford a speedy remedy and to avoid delay, this does not mean that the court is without power to extend the time within which a respondent may answer, or that the answer may not be amended, and leave to amend should be freely given when

justice demands. State ex rel. Fitzhugh v. City Council of Hot Springs, 56 N.M. 118, 241 P.2d 100 (1952).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus §§ 432 to 437. Absence of appropriation or funds as defense to mandamus to compel payment of salary of public officer or employee, 5 A.L.R. 579.

Unconstitutionality of statute as defense to mandamus proceeding, 30 A.L.R. 378; 129 A.L.R. 941.

55 C.J.S. Mandamus §§ 272 to 274.

§ 44-2-10. [Peremptory mandamus on failure to answer; procedure after answer.]

If no answer is made a peremptory mandamus shall be allowed against the defendant; if an answer is made containing new matter, the plaintiff may, on the trial or other proceedings, avail himself of any valid objection to its sufficiency, or may countervail it by evidence either in direct denial or by way of avoidance.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 44; C.L. 1884, § 1999; C.L. 1897, § 2767; Code 1915, § 3419; C.S. 1929, § 86-109; 1941 Comp., § 26-110; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-10.

Answer may assign legal reasons for defense and plead facts. - The answer to an alternative writ of mandamus under our statutes may assign any legal reasons upon which respondent relies to defeat the writ, as well as plead the facts on which he relies. State ex rel. Garcia v. Board of Comm'rs, 21 N.M. 632, 157 P. 656 (1916).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus §§ 441, 442. 55 C.J.S. Mandamus §§ 282 to 284.

§ 44-2-11. [Pleadings allowed; proceedings as in civil actions.]

No other pleading or written allegation is allowed than the writ and answer. They shall be construed and amended in the same manner as pleadings in a civil action, and the issues thereby joined shall be tried and further proceedings had in the same manner as in a civil action.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 45; C.L. 1884, § 2000; C.L. 1897, § 2768; Code 1915, § 3420; C.S. 1929, § 86-110; 1941 Comp., § 26-111; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-11.

Cross-references. - For contents of the writ, see 44-2-6 NMSA 1978. As to construction of pleadings, see Rule 1-008F SCRA 1986. For amended and supplemental pleadings, see Rule 1-015 SCRA 1986. For the rules regulating trials, see Rules 1-038 to 1-053 SCRA 1986.

Writ and answer only mandamus pleadings considered before supreme court. - On a petition for writ of mandamus under original jurisdiction of the supreme court, the pleadings to be considered are the petitioner's alternative writ of mandamus and the answer by the respondent. *State ex rel. Heron v. Kool*, 47 N.M. 218, 140 P.2d 737 (1943).

Case must be tried on writ and answer. - The complaint itself drops out of the picture and the writ must contain allegations of all facts necessary to authorize the relief sought. Furthermore, allegations in the writ should be made as in ordinary actions. Hence, the usual rules applicable in testing the sufficiency of a complaint in an ordinary civil action apply. The facts should be pleaded with the same certainty, neither more nor less. *Laumbach v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 60 N.M. 226, 290 P.2d 1067 (1955).

Pleadings are to be construed as in ordinary civil actions. *State ex rel. Garcia v. Board of Comm'rs*, 21 N.M. 632, 157 P. 656 (1916).

Writ must allege facts necessary to authorize relief sought. - See same catchline in notes to 44-2-6 NMSA 1978.

Fact allegations in application form no part of writ. - Allegations of fact in an application for alternative writ of mandamus form no part of the writ and ordinarily cannot be so considered in determining the legal sufficiency of the writ. *Mora County Bd. of Educ. v. Valdez*, 61 N.M. 361, 300 P.2d 943 (1956).

Unless respondent answers allegations as though they were in writ. - Where respondent answers the allegations in the application, treating them as though contained in the alternative writ, they should be treated as supplementing those contained in the writ. Allegations of fact should be pleaded with the same certainty as in ordinary actions. *State ex rel. Burg v. City of Albuquerque*, 31 N.M. 576, 249 P. 242 (1926).

Time extension and leave to amend freely given when necessary. - While office of mandamus is to afford a speedy remedy and to avoid delay, this does not mean that the court is without power to extend the time within which a respondent may answer, or that the answer may not be amended, and leave to amend should be freely given when justice demands. *State ex rel. Fitzhugh v. City Council of Hot Springs*, 56 N.M. 118, 241 P.2d 100 (1952).

Legal objections raised by answer only. - The issues in mandamus are created solely by and are limited to the allegations of the writ and the answer thereto. Legal objections must be raised by the answer and, where the defense of abandonment of the suit after judgment was not in the pleadings, it could not have been considered or passed upon by the trial court. *State ex rel. State Hwy. Comm'n v. Quesenberry*, 72 N.M. 291, 383 P.2d 255 (1963).

Issues must be raised by answer. - In mandamus to compel levy of tax to satisfy judgment on certificates of indebtedness, issues, requiring allegations of fact pleaded in

bar should have been raised by answer and not by demurrer (now motion) to alternative writ. *State ex rel. Chesher v. Beall*, 41 N.M. 652, 73 P.2d 329 (1937).

Court may construe pleading raising legal questions as answer. - Though a motion to dismiss is not an appropriate pleading in mandamus, the court may construe a pleading which raises legal questions as an answer, admitting the facts stated therein and invoking the court's application of the law thereto. *State ex rel. Fitzhugh v. City Council of Hot Springs*, 56 N.M. 118, 241 P.2d 100 (1952).

With exception of pleadings mandamus tried as other civil actions. - Mandamus is a civil action, and, with the exception of the pleadings, is tried and proceeded with in the same manner as other civil actions. The writ and the return constitute all the pleadings which shall be allowed. If the writ does not state sufficient grounds to authorize it, the respondent might demur (now move) thereto, and thus raise a question of law, which, if overruled by the court, would be such a final judgment as would authorize him to appeal. *Eldodt v. Territory ex rel. Vaughn*, 10 N.M. 141, 61 P. 105 (1900); *Conklin v. Cunningham*, 7 N.M. 445, 38 P. 170 (1894); *Perez v. Barber*, 7 N.M. 223, 34 P. 190 (1893).

Appeal dismissed where required procedures in mandamus proceedings not followed. - See same catchline in notes to 44-2-6 NMSA 1978.

Jury trial not necessary preliminary to valid judgment. - Determination of the facts by a jury in a mandamus case is not a necessary preliminary to a valid judgment. *Delgado v. Chavez*, 5 N.M. 646, 25 P. 948, *aff'd*, 140 U.S. 586, 11 S. Ct. 874, 35 L. Ed. 578 (1891); *Territory ex rel. Lewis v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 5 N.M. (Gild., E.W.S. ed.) 1, 16 P. 855 (1888).

Inconsistencies in mandamus and quo warranto proceedings grounds for quashing. - The denial in proceedings by mandamus that the plaintiff therein was a de facto sheriff, while maintaining, as he must, in a collateral proceeding by way of quo warranto, that the same person was de facto in charge of the office, was so inconsistent that the return containing the denial could have been quashed for this reason alone. *Conklin v. Cunningham*, 7 N.M. 445, 38 P. 170 (1894).

Amicus curiae cannot raise constitutionality where party fails to. - An amicus curiae is not a party and cannot assume the functions of a party; he must accept the case before the court with the issues made by the parties, and if the constitutionality of a statute is not raised by a party claiming to be adversely affected, the amicus curiae cannot do so. *State ex rel. Burg v. City of Albuquerque*, 31 N.M. 576, 249 P. 242 (1926).

Law reviews. - For article, "Mandamus in New Mexico," see 4 N.M. L. Rev. 155 (1974).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus § 413. 55 C.J.S. Mandamus § 257.

§ 44-2-12. [Judgment for plaintiff; damages; costs; peremptory writ.]

If judgment is given for the plaintiff, he shall recover the damages which he has sustained, together with costs and disbursements, and a peremptory mandamus shall be awarded without delay.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 46; C.L. 1884, § 2001; C.L. 1897, § 2769; Code 1915, § 3421; C.S. 1929, § 86-111; 1941 Comp., § 26-112; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-12.

Section permits damage award in conjunction with granting of a peremptory writ of mandamus. The trial court having denied the writ, appellant cannot recover damages. *New Mexico Bus Sales v. Michael*, 68 N.M. 223, 360 P.2d 639 (1961).

Attorney fees are not recoverable as a part of the damages sustained, or costs and disbursements, under this section. *State ex rel. Roberson v. Board of Educ.*, 70 N.M. 261, 372 P.2d 832 (1962).

Law reviews. - For survey, "Torts: Sovereign and Governmental Immunity in New Mexico," see 6 N.M. L. Rev. 249 (1976).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d Mandamus §§ 357, 495 to 498.

Allowance of damages to successful plaintiff or relator in mandamus, 73 A.L.R.2d 903. Allowance of attorney's fees in mandamus proceedings, 34 A.L.R.4th 457. 55 C.J.S. Mandamus §§ 342, 375 to 379.

§ 44-2-13. [Officer or board refusing to perform duty; fine; other action for penalty barred.]

Whenever a peremptory mandamus is directed to a public officer, body or board, commanding the performance of any public duty specially enjoined by law, if it appears to the court that such officer or any member of such body or board, without just excuse, refuses or neglects to perform the duty so enjoined, the court may impose a fine not exceeding two hundred and fifty dollars [(\$250)] upon every such officer or member of such body or board; such fine, when collected, shall be paid into the state treasury, and the payment of such fine is a bar to an action for any penalty incurred by such officer or member of such body or board, by reason of his refusal or neglect to perform the duty so enjoined.

History: Laws 1884, ch. 1, § 47; C.L. 1884, § 2002; C.L. 1897, § 2770; Code 1915, § 3422; C.S. 1929, § 86-112; 1941 Comp., § 26-113; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-13.

This section does not exclude power of court to punish for disobedience of the writ, or to compel obedience to the writ by imprisonment until compliance. *Delgado v. Chavez*, 5 N.M. 646, 25 P. 948, *aff'd*, 140 U.S. 586, 11 S. Ct. 874, 35 L. Ed. 578 (1891).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d *Mandamus* § 482.
Contempt for disobedience of mandamus, 30 A.L.R. 148.
55 C.J.S. *Mandamus* §§ 359, 360.

§ 44-2-14. [Review of proceedings.]

That in all cases of proceedings by mandamus in any district court of this state, the final judgment of the court thereon shall be reviewable by appeal or writ of error in the same manner as now provided by law in other civil cases.

History: Laws 1887, ch. 60, § 1; C.L. 1897, § 2773; Laws 1899, ch. 80, § 8; Code 1915, § 3424; C.S. 1929, § 86-114; 1941 Comp., § 26-114; 1953 Comp., § 22-12-14.

Cross-references. - As to appeals and writs of error generally, see Rules 12-201 to 12-216, and 12-501 to 12-504, SCRA 1986.

Supreme court of New Mexico may modify judgment of district court in mandamus on appeal. *Territory ex rel. Coler v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 14 N.M. 134, 89 P. 252 (1907), *aff'd*, 215 U.S. 296, 30 S. Ct. 111, 54 L. Ed. 202 (1909).

Jurisdiction over mandamus parties. - Where a mandamus proceeding is consolidated with a district court appeal from a decision of the personnel board, the court of appeals has jurisdiction over the mandamus parties. *State ex rel. New Mexico State Hwy. Dep't v. Silva*, 98 N.M. 549, 650 P.2d 833 (Ct. App. 1982).

Law reviews. - For article, "Mandamus in New Mexico," see 4 N.M. L. Rev. 155 (1974).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 52 Am. Jur. 2d *Mandamus* § 490.
Stay or supersedeas on appellate review in mandamus proceeding, 88 A.L.R.2d 420.
55 C.J.S. *Mandamus* § 362.

Article 3

Quo Warranto

§ 44-3-1. [Commencement of proceedings; complaint; writ permissive.]

The remedies heretofore obtainable by writ of quo warranto and by proceedings by information in the nature of quo warranto shall be commenced by the filing of a complaint as in other civil actions, and it shall not be necessary to sue out such writs in form, but this section shall not prevent nor be construed to prohibit the use by the supreme court and the district courts of the state of writs and proceedings in the forms hitherto used in such cases by such courts.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 1; C.S. 1929, § 115-101; 1941 Comp., § 26-201; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-1.

Cross-references. - As to extraordinary writs in exercise of supreme court's original jurisdiction, see Rule 12-504 SCRA 1986.

Quo warranto is an ancient common-law writ, the origins of which are obscured by time. *State ex rel. Anaya v. McBride*, 88 N.M. 244, 539 P.2d 1006 (1975).

Quo warranto statutes liberally construed to effectuate purpose. - Statutes such as those concerning quo warranto are remedial in character, and as such should be liberally interpreted to effectuate the objects intended. One of the primary purposes of quo warranto is to ascertain whether one is constitutionally authorized to hold the office he claims, whether by election or appointment, and the supreme court must liberally interpret the quo warranto statutes to effectuate that purpose. *State ex rel. Anaya v. McBride*, 88 N.M. 244, 539 P.2d 1006 (1975).

Writ of quo warranto is a writ of grace and not of right. *De Vigil v. Stroup*, 15 N.M. 544, 110 P. 830 (1910) (decided under former law).

Statutory remedy for contest of elections superseded quo warranto. - Statutory remedy for contest of elections to public office has superseded quo warranto, but in other respects the remedy at common law and under the statute is in force. *Orchard v. Board of Comm'rs*, 42 N.M. 172, 76 P.2d 41 (1938); *State ex rel. Abercrombie v. District Court*, 37 N.M. 407, 24 P.2d 265 (1933).

Remedy of quo warranto may be invoked against municipal corporations, or quasi-municipal corporations, as well as private corporations, to oust them from the usurpation of a franchise or power not authorized by the charter or the laws under which they are organized. *Orchard v. Board of Comm'rs*, 42 N.M. 172, 76 P.2d 41 (1938).

But consolidated rural school district is not a municipal corporation. - A consolidated rural school district was not a de facto or quasi-municipal corporation so that it would fall within the doctrine that quo warranto is the sole remedy for attacking existence of a corporation. *Thrall v. Grant County Bd. of Educ.*, 38 N.M. 358, 33 P.2d 908 (1934).

Proceedings must be brought in name of state. - A private person may not bring proceedings by quo warranto to contest a state office; they must be brought in the name of the state. State ex rel. Hannett v. District Court, 30 N.M. 300, 233 P. 1002 (1925).

Proceeding goes only to removing intruder from office. - A private person cannot have writ of quo warranto to adjudicate his title to an office. The proceeding in the nature of quo warranto goes only to removing the intruder. De Vigil v. Stroup, 15 N.M. 544, 110 P. 830 (1910) (decided under former law).

Court cannot on its own initiative remove officer for misconduct. - Such a proceeding can only be brought by one having the requisite interest therein or the statutory right or authority. State ex rel. White v. Clevenger, 69 N.M. 64, 364 P.2d 128 (1961).

Quo warranto proceeding against district judge purely personal. - A proceeding in quo warranto against a district judge is a proceeding to inquire into his right to hold office and has only incidental reference to any official action. The proceeding is purely personal. State ex rel. Holloman v. Leib, 17 N.M. 270, 125 P. 601 (1912) (decided under former law).

Special tax attorney not public officer. - Writ may not be used to test the legal right of a member of the New Mexico house of representatives to be employed as special tax attorney, since such attorney is not a public officer. State ex rel. Gibson v. Fernandez, 40 N.M. 288, 58 P.2d 1197 (1936).

Right of one claiming election as acequia commissioner to proceed under this act is not affected by Laws 1921, ch. 129 (73-2-14, 73-3-3 NMSA 1978). State ex rel. Besse v. District Court, 31 N.M. 82, 239 P. 452 (1925).

Jurisdiction of quo warranto proceedings is in the district court, although it does not determine the character of the proceeding. Territory ex rel. Wade v. Ashenfelter, 4 N.M. (Gild.) 93, 12 P. 879 (1887), appeal dismissed, 154 U.S. 493, 14 S. Ct. 1141, 38 L. Ed. 1079 (1893) (decided under former law).

Legislation which affects constitutionally vested judicial power not binding. - Since the constitution provides for separate and equal branches of government in New Mexico, any legislative measure which affects pleading, practice or procedure in relation to a power expressly vested by the constitution in the judiciary, such as quo warranto, cannot be deemed binding. State ex rel. Anaya v. McBride, 88 N.M. 244, 539 P.2d 1006 (1975).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto §§ 86 to 88. Right of corporation to act as relator in information in the nature of quo warranto, 1 A.L.R. 197.

Quo warranto as proper remedy to enforce forfeiture of street railway franchise, 34 A.L.R. 1425.

Quo warranto as a remedy for violation of criminal or penal statute by corporation, 53

A.L.R. 1038.

Quo warranto to protect corporation against use of name by another corporation, 66 A.L.R. 1026; 72 A.L.R.3d 8.

Practice of law by corporation as ground for quo warranto, 73 A.L.R. 1336; 105 A.L.R. 1376; 157 A.L.R. 310.

Quo warranto to test result of primary election, 86 A.L.R. 246.

Quo warranto to test right to serve as grand or petit juror, 91 A.L.R. 1009.

Holding or parent corporation as a necessary or proper party to a quo warranto proceeding against subsidiary corporation, 106 A.L.R. 1188.

Quo warranto as remedy in field of taxation, 109 A.L.R. 324.

Quo warranto to oust incumbent of public office, based on misconduct or other ground of forfeiture, 119 A.L.R. 725.

Power of district, county or prosecuting attorney to bring action of quo warranto, 153 A.L.R. 899.

Corporation as necessary or proper party defendant in proceedings to determine validity of election or appointment of corporate director or officer, 21 A.L.R.2d 1048.

Statute of limitations or laches as applied to quo warranto proceedings, 26 A.L.R.2d 828.

Right to maintain quo warranto proceedings to test title to or existence of public office by private person not claiming office, 51 A.L.R.2d 1306.

74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto § 34.

§ 44-3-2. [Trial; time; use of jury permissive.]

Actions of quo warranto shall be set down and summarily tried as soon as the issues are made up and the court shall have power, if he deems proper, to summon a jury for the purpose and prescribe the manner of summoning the same.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 2; C.S. 1929, § 115-102; 1941 Comp., § 26-202; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-2.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto §§ 108 to 111.

74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto §§ 44, 46.

§ 44-3-3. [Name of private relator to be shown.]

When an action shall be brought by the attorney general or district attorney by virtue of this chapter [44-3-1 to 44-3-16 NMSA 1978], on the relation or information of a person or persons, having an interest in the question, the name of such person shall be joined with the state as relator.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 3; C.S. 1929, § 115-103; 1941 Comp., § 26-203; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-3.

Proceedings must be brought in name of state. - See same catchline in notes to 44-3-1 NMSA 1978.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto §§ 61, 62, 64.

Right of corporation to act as relator in information in the nature of quo warranto, 1 A.L.R. 197.

74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto §§ 25, 27.

§ 44-3-4. [Who may bring action; private relators; when action lies.]

An action may be brought by the attorney general or district attorney in the name of the state, upon his information or upon the complaint of any private person, against the parties offending in the following cases:

A. when any person shall usurp, intrude into or unlawfully hold or exercise any public office, civil or military, or any franchise within this state, or any office or offices in a corporation created by authority of this state; or,

B. when any public officer, civil or military, shall have done or suffered an act which, by the provisions of law, shall work a forfeiture of his office; or,

C. when any association or number of persons shall act, within this state, as a corporation without being duly incorporated, or in case of a foreign corporation, without being duly authorized, to do business within this state.

The district attorneys in their respective judicial districts shall exercise the same power and right given by this section to the attorney general in cases which may be limited in their operation to the said district.

When the attorney general or district attorney refuses to act, or when the office usurped pertains to a county, incorporated village, town or city, or school district, such action may be brought in the name of the state by a private person on his own complaint.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 4; C.S. 1929, § 115-104; 1941 Comp., § 26-204; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-4.

- I. General Consideration.
- II. Who Brings Action.
- III. Private Relators.
- IV. When Action Lies.

I. General Consideration.

Cross-references. - For other annotations applicable to this section, see 44-3-1 NMSA 1978. As to existing election contest provisions being unaffected by quo warranto provisions, see 44-3-15 NMSA 1978 and notes thereto. As to quo warranto proceedings against a corporation for violation of act regulating financing of automobiles, see 57-11-7 NMSA 1978.

Action lies to contest constitutionality of judge's appointment. - Where respondent was elected to the New Mexico senate at the general election held November 3, 1970 for a four-year term, during which the salaries of district judges were increased by \$7000 per annum, and was again a successful candidate for election to the New Mexico senate at the general election held November 5, 1974, but was appointed by the governor to the district bench before he qualified and prior to the commencement of the 1975 legislative session, it was held in a quo warranto proceeding that respondent's appointment to the office of district judge was in violation of N.M. Const., art. IV, § 28 and was accordingly invalid. *State ex rel. Anaya v. McBride*, 88 N.M. 244, 539 P.2d 1006 (1975).

Proceedings not place to question statute's constitutionality where respondent accepted benefits. - Respondent senator, who at no time questioned the constitutionality of the 1972 Senate Reapportionment Act (former 2-8-1 to 2-8-53 NMSA 1978) or the district court decree which held he did not have to run again in 1972, and enjoyed the benefit of the law which allowed him to retain his position without contest in 1972, would not be heard to question its propriety in quo warranto proceedings, challenging his right to be a district judge; a de facto officer is estopped from taking advantage of his own want of title. *State ex rel. Anaya v. McBride*, 88 N.M. 244, 539 P.2d 1006 (1975).

Law reviews. - For article, "Survey of New Mexico Law, 1979-80: Administrative Law," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 1 (1981).

For article, "Separation of Powers and the Judicial Rule-Making Power in New Mexico: The Need for Prudential Restraints," see 15 N.M.L. Rev. 407 (1985).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto §§ 12 to 48, 60 to 64.

Right of corporation to act as relator in information in the nature of quo warranto, 1 A.L.R. 197.

Teacher as an officer whose right may be tested by quo warranto, 30 A.L.R. 1423.

Quo warranto as proper remedy to enforce forfeiture of franchise, 34 A.L.R. 1425.

Condemnation by de facto corporation, right of landowner to question by quo warranto legality of corporate existence, 44 A.L.R. 555.

Parties in quo warranto proceedings against corporation, because of practice of law by, 73 A.L.R. 1336.

Holding or parent corporation as necessary or proper party to quo warranto proceeding against subsidiary corporation, 106 A.L.R. 1188.

Power of district, county or prosecuting attorney to bring action of quo warranto, 131

A.L.R. 1207; 153 A.L.R. 899.

Right to maintain quo warranto proceedings to test title to or existence of public office by private person not claiming office, 51 A.L.R.2d 1306.

Noncivil service public employee, remedy with respect to discharge, under state veterans' tenure statute, 58 A.L.R.2d 1005.

Remedy for determining right or title to office in unincorporated private association, 82 A.L.R.2d 1172.

Quo warranto proceedings under Absentee Voters' Laws, 97 A.L.R.2d 344.

74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto §§ 6 to 14, 25 to 31.

II. Who Brings Action.

State, through attorney general, is indispensable party plaintiff in quo warranto proceeding to challenge the propriety of an election contest, since a private person cannot have the writ to adjudicate his title to an office, and, indeed, the proceeding in the nature of a quo warranto goes only to removing the intruder, and no further. State ex rel. Anaya v. McBride, 88 N.M. 244, 539 P.2d 1006 (1975).

Court cannot on its own initiative remove officer for misconduct. Such a proceeding can only be brought by one having the requisite interest therein or the statutory right or authority. State ex rel. White v. Clevenger, 69 N.M. 64, 364 P.2d 128 (1961).

Lack of jurisdiction where indispensable party not joined in action. - In an action in quo warranto challenging the validity of special zoning districts, where the county commissioners are an indispensable party and are not joined, the trial court lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate the merits of plaintiffs' quo warranto action. State ex rel. Huning v. Los Chavez Zoning Comm'n, 93 N.M. 655, 604 P.2d 121 (1979), cert. denied, 97 N.M. 472, 641 P.2d 503 (1982).

Court without jurisdiction unless attorney general can sue. - Unless the attorney general has the right and capacity to maintain the action, the court is without jurisdiction. State ex rel. White v. Clevenger, 69 N.M. 64, 364 P.2d 128 (1961).

District attorney may test corporation's statewide authority. - The district attorney would have authority to bring a quo warranto action to test statewide authority of a corporation. State ex rel. Attorney Gen. v. Reese, 78 N.M. 241, 430 P.2d 399 (1967).

III. Private Relators.

Private party may act when statutory requirements met. - Unless statutory requirements are met, there is no authority in a private person to make application. State ex rel. Hannett v. District Court, 30 N.M. 300, 233 P. 1002 (1925).

And private party may act when district attorney refuses. - This section authorizes a private person to institute action in the name of the state, claiming election to office of acequia commissioner, the district attorney having refused to act. State ex rel. Besse v. District Court, 31 N.M. 82, 239 P. 452 (1925).

If attorney general refuses to act then citizen can. - Under this section, quo warranto proceedings cannot be instituted for the removal of a public officer by a private citizen unless the attorney general refuses to bring such action. 1939-40 Op. Att'y Gen. 134.

IV. When Action Lies.

Action proper when officer said to forfeit office. - Where the acts of an officer are said to work a forfeiture of the office, ipso facto, quo warranto is a proper remedy. State ex rel. Martinez v. Padilla, 94 N.M. 431, 612 P.2d 223 (1980).

And where misuse of money. - Where public officers are disqualified for misuse of public funds, the court has jurisdiction to remove them by a writ of quo warranto. State ex rel. Martinez v. Padilla, 94 N.M. 431, 612 P.2d 223 (1980).

When requirement for quo warranto not met. - Where there has been no showing that the attorney general of this state has refused to act on behalf of the private litigant plaintiffs, the statutory requirement for quo warranto has not been met, and there is no authority in the plaintiffs to file an application in quo warranto. State ex rel. Huning v. Los Chavez Zoning Comm'n, 93 N.M. 655, 604 P.2d 121 (1979), cert. denied, 97 N.M. 472, 641 P.2d 503 (1982).

Office of commissioner of special zoning district commission is "public office" for which an action lies in quo warranto. State ex rel. Huning v. Los Chavez Zoning Comm'n, 93 N.M. 655, 604 P.2d 121 (1979), cert. denied, 97 N.M. 472, 641 P.2d 503 (1982).

Quo warranto to ascertain whether public officer constitutionally and legally authorized to perform any act in or exercise any functions of the office to which he lays claim. State ex rel. Anaya v. McBride, 88 N.M. 244, 539 P.2d 1006 (1975).

Problems involving legal title to office are germane only in a proceeding by quo warranto. Conklin v. Cunningham, 7 N.M. 445, 38 P. 170 (1894) (decided under former law).

Misconduct of officer does not of itself amount to forfeiture of the office. An officer rightfully in office can only be removed for misconduct in a proper proceeding. State ex rel. White v. Clevenger, 69 N.M. 64, 364 P.2d 128 (1961).

Quo warranto is not cumulative remedy or one in addition to any special statutory remedy for contesting elections contained in the Election Code. *State v. Rodriguez*, 65 N.M. 80, 332 P.2d 1005 (1958).

Statutory remedy for contesting elections to public office is exclusive, and has superseded quo warranto. *Orchard v. Board of Comm'rs*, 42 N.M. 172, 76 P.2d 41 (1938) (decided under former election laws).

If other election provision applies, quo warranto not available. - Quo warranto is no longer available to an unsuccessful candidate if the contest procedure established by the Election Code applies to the public office in question. *State v. Rodriguez*, 65 N.M. 80, 332 P.2d 1005 (1958) (decided under former Election Code).

But it lies if no other statutory provision exists. - Quo warranto was a proper action to bring since there was no provision in the Election Code or other related statutes providing for contests for municipal school board elections. *State v. Rodriguez*, 65 N.M. 80, 332 P.2d 1005 (1958) (decided under former Election Code).

Writ used to test right to land grant trusteeship. - The writ may be used to test the right to the office of trustee of the Tecolote land grant. *State ex rel. Valdez v. Moise*, 42 N.M. 280, 76 P.2d 1155 (1938).

But not used when questioned office not public. - The position of special tax attorney is not a public office, and quo warranto is not the proper proceeding to test the right of an individual to hold that position at the same time he is a member of the state legislature. *State ex rel. Gibson v. Fernandez*, 40 N.M. 288, 58 P.2d 1197 (1936).

Language refers to officer's right to act not actions. - The term employed in the statute, "unlawfully hold or exercise . . . any office . . . in a corporation," refers to the right of one to act as an officer and not to the acts of the officer in the discharge of his duties, where such acts do not ipso facto operate as, or amount to, a forfeiture of the office. *State ex rel. White v. Clevenger*, 69 N.M. 64, 364 P.2d 128 (1961).

Thus writ not proper remedy unless acts amount to forfeiture. - Quo warranto is not a proper remedy to test the legality of the acts of an officer or his misconduct in office, nor to compel, restrain or obtain a review of such acts unless they amount to a forfeiture of the office, where neither the title to the office nor the right to a franchise is involved. *State ex rel. White v. Clevenger*, 69 N.M. 64, 364 P.2d 128 (1961).

§ 44-3-5. [Cost bond to be posted by private relator.]

Before any writ shall issue in an action brought upon the complaint or information of a private relator under the provisions of this act [44-3-1 to 44-3-16 NMSA 1978], such private person shall file with the clerk of the court issuing such writ a cost bond in an amount to be fixed by the court, executed and acknowledged as required by law in the

case of supersedeas bonds on appeal, to be approved by the clerk of said court, conditioned as now required by law in the case of cost bonds in the district court.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 5; C.S. 1929, § 115-105; 1941 Comp., § 26-205; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-5.

Failure to give cost bond will not defeat jurisdiction where the defendant has made a general appearance. *State ex rel. Besse v. District Court*, 31 N.M. 82, 239 P. 452 (1925).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto § 59.
74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto § 17.

§ 44-3-6. [Usurpation of office; allegations in complaint; compensation of defendant; bond; injunction.]

Whenever such action shall be brought against a person for usurping an office, the attorney general, district attorney or person complaining, in addition to the statement of the cause of action, shall also set forth in the complaint the name of the person rightfully entitled to the office with a statement of his right thereto, and in such cases, upon proof by affidavit that the defendant has received or is about to receive the fees and emoluments of the office by virtue of his usurpation thereof, the judge of the district court wherein such proceeding is pending, or a justice of the supreme court, if the proceeding be therein pending, may by order require the defendant to furnish a good and sufficient bond, within a designated time not exceeding fifteen days, executed and acknowledged as required by law in the case of supersedeas bonds on appeal, to be approved by said judge, conditioned that in case the person alleged to be entitled to the office should prevail, the defendant will repay to him all fees and emoluments of the office received by him and by means of his usurpation thereof, and in addition to said bond, or in case of a failure to give said bond, the said judge or justice shall upon good cause shown, issue a writ of injunction directed to the proper disbursing officer enjoining and restraining him from issuing to the defendant or his assigns any warrant, check, certificate or certificates of indebtedness representing fees or emoluments of said office, until the final adjudication of said cause.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 6; C.S. 1929, § 115-106; 1941 Comp., § 26-206; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-6.

Supreme court would not give approval to portion of this section which requires the name of the person rightfully entitled to the office involved in a quo warranto proceeding to be set forth in the complaint, at least not if it is meant to affect the subject matter jurisdiction of the court, especially since the statute is inconsistent with Rule 12(a), N.M.R. App. P. (Civ.) (now see Rule 1-012A SCRA 1986), since in any situation where a vacancy was filled by appointment under such reasoning the court would be shorn of its constitutional powers vis-a-vis quo warranto, and presumably, with additional bits of

legislative ingenuity, of its powers to issue other extraordinary writs as well; such could not have been the intention of the people when N.M. Const., art. III, § 1 and art. VI, § 3 were adopted. State ex rel. Anaya v. McBride, 88 N.M. 244, 539 P.2d 1006 (1975).

Requirement of name of person rightfully entitled to office procedural. - The supreme court has power and authority to hear and determine quo warranto cases and to grant relief. There is thus no question at all concerning its jurisdiction. The statutory provision requiring the name of the person rightfully entitled to the office to be set forth in the complaint is clearly procedural. State ex rel. Anaya v. McBride, 88 N.M. 244, 539 P.2d 1006 (1975).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto § 89.
Teacher as an officer whose right may be tested by quo warranto, 30 A.L.R. 1423.
Quo warranto to test results of primary election, 86 A.L.R. 246.
Quo warranto to try title or right to office connected with administration of tax statute, 109 A.L.R. 330.
74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto §§ 7, 37.

§ 44-3-7. [Right to elective office; allegations concerning election.]

In all actions brought to determine the right to any office it shall be necessary for the plaintiff or relator whenever the defendant is in possession of the office in controversy under a certificate of election issued by the proper officer or board of canvassers, to state in his complaint in what respect such certificate was improperly or illegally issued; and in case it is claimed that the relator received a majority of legal votes cast for the office at any legal election to fill such office he shall also state in such complaint the number of legal votes cast, as far as he may be able so to do, for the relator and for the defendant for such office respectively, and also the number of votes cast for the relator and for the defendant respectively for such office, as determined by the legal canvass of such election.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 7; C.S. 1929, § 115-107; 1941 Comp., § 26-207; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-7.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto § 89.
Election ballots as admissible in quo warranto proceedings, 71 A.L.R.2d 353.

§ 44-3-8. [Time of hearing demurrer, amending complaint, filing answer and trial; application for continuance.]

If a demurrer to the complaint in such actions be filed by the defendant the same shall be heard and determined within six days from the date of service of a copy upon counsel for the plaintiff and relator, and if the demurrer is sustained, plaintiff and relator will be given not to exceed five days to amend the complaint, and if it is overruled then

the defendant shall have a like time to file the answer, provided that upon good cause shown the court may extend the time of either party, but in no event shall the time be extended to either party more than four days. The issue as finally made shall stand for trial forthwith; and no continuance of any such cause shall be granted upon the application of either party unless he shall show the absence of a witness or other testimony and they shall be deemed material by the court. The plaintiff or relator may traverse or offer counter evidence to the facts set forth in such application for continuance.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 8; C.S. 1929, § 115-108; 1941 Comp., § 26-208; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-8.

Cross-references. - For the abolition of demurrers except in special statutory proceedings where the existing rules conflict, see Rules 1-001 and 1-007C SCRA 1986.

Erroneous for court overruling demurrer to render final judgment. - It is a fundamental rule of law that it is ordinarily erroneous for a court on overruling a demurrer to render final judgment. State v. Rodriguez, 65 N.M. 80, 332 P.2d 1005 (1958).

No provisions for demurrer to amended complaint which is sustained. - This statute makes no provisions for a case where the amended complaint has been filed, followed by a second demurrer which is sustained and an appeal taken to the supreme court. State v. Rodriguez, 65 N.M. 80, 332 P.2d 1005 (1958).

If second demurrer overruled on appeal, time to answer given. - Where an amended complaint was filed in quo warranto action, and second demurrer thereto was sustained, and, on appeal to supreme court, the demurrer was, in effect, overruled, defendants should be granted statutory time within which to answer. State v. Rodriguez, 65 N.M. 80, 332 P.2d 1005 (1958).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto §§ 95, 98. 74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto §§ 40, 41.

§ 44-3-9. [Judgment; nature; expiration of term of office before rendition.]

In every case such judgment shall be rendered upon the right of the defendant and also upon the right of the party alleged to be entitled, or only upon the right of the defendant, as justice may require. When the action shall not be terminated during the term of the office in controversy it may notwithstanding be prosecuted to completion and judgment rendered, which shall determine the right which any party had to the office, and to the fees and emoluments thereof.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 9; C.S. 1929, § 115-109; 1941 Comp., § 26-209; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-9.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto § 112.
74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto § 48.

§ 44-3-10. [Judgment for relator claiming office; provisions for changing possession; enforcement; punishment for contempt.]

If the judgment be rendered in favor of the person so alleged to be entitled to the office, it shall provide that upon his qualification as required by law, he shall immediately thereafter demand of the defendant in the action all the books and papers and insignia of the office in his custody and control and that the defendant shall immediately comply therewith by turning over to him all of said books, papers and insignia of the office. If the defendant fails or in anywise refuses to comply with said demand, the plaintiff or relator shall have an order of the court in said proceeding citing the defendant as for contempt and directing him to show cause why he should not be punished therefor and, if upon the hearing it be shown that the defendant was guilty of disobeying such order, the court shall impose a fine of not less than one hundred (\$100.00) dollars, and not more than one thousand (\$1,000.00) dollars, or not less than thirty (30) days nor more than ninety (90) days in the county jail, or both such fine and imprisonment within the limits stated. In addition the court may direct the further imprisonment of the party in contempt until he complies with the order of the court. In addition to the foregoing such proceedings may be had as are provided for by law to compel the delivery of such papers, books and insignia of office.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 10; C.S. 1929, § 115-110; 1941 Comp., § 26-210; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-10.

Cross-references. - As to contempt proceedings, see 34-1-2 to 34-1-5 NMSA 1978.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto §§ 114, 116, 120.
74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto §§ 48 to 50.

§ 44-3-11. [Costs.]

The prevailing party in such proceedings may recover his costs from his opponent, provided that no costs shall be taxable against the state nor the attorney general when acting as relator, but such costs shall be taxable against and recovered from a private relator whenever the judgment is for the defendant.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 11; C.S. 1929, § 115-111; 1941 Comp., § 26-211; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-11.

Cross-references. - For provision concerning costs in judgment finding defendant guilty of usurpation of office, see 44-3-14 NMSA 1978.

This section rather than civil rule governs costs. - In an action in quo warranto, the taxation of costs, other than the receivership costs, is governed by this section (costs in quo warranto proceedings) rather than by Rule 54(d), N.M.R. Civ. P. (now see Rule 1-054E SCRA 1986). *White v. Clevenger*, 71 N.M. 80, 376 P.2d 31 (1962).

This section exempts the state and attorney general from costs. *State ex rel. Hannett v. District Court*, 30 N.M. 300, 233 P. 1002 (1925).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto §§ 118, 131. 74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto § 52.

§ 44-3-12. [Judgment for relator claiming office; provisions concerning compensation; separate action for damages.]

When the judgment is for the person so alleged to be entitled to the office, he may have included therein a money judgment against the defendant and the surety or sureties on his bond, if furnished as in Section 6 [44-3-6 NMSA 1978] provided, for all fees and emoluments collected by him during the term involved in such case with interest thereon at six percent per annum; and he may recover by separate action the damages which he shall have sustained by reason of the usurpation by the defendant of the office from which by virtue of said judgment said defendant has been excluded.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 12; C.S. 1929, § 115-112; 1941 Comp., § 26-212; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-12.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto § 117.

§ 44-3-13. [Joinder of defendants.]

When several persons claim to be entitled to the same office or franchise, or if they collectively claim to be entitled to exercise the franchise of a corporation created by the authority of this state, one action may be brought against all such persons in order to try their, and each of their, respective rights to such office or franchise.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 13; C.S. 1929, § 115-113; 1941 Comp., § 26-213; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-13.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto § 83. 74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto § 32.

§ 44-3-14. [Judgment finding defendant guilty of usurpation of office; provisions concerning exclusion and costs.]

When a defendant against whom such action shall have been brought shall be adjudged guilty of usurping or intruding into or unlawfully holding or exercising any office, franchise or privilege, judgment shall be rendered that such defendant be excluded from such office, franchise or privilege, and that the plaintiff recover costs against such defendant.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 14; C.S. 1929, § 115-114; 1941 Comp., § 26-214; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-14.

Cross-references. - As to costs generally, see 44-3-11 NMSA 1978.

Quo warranto is not proper remedy to test alleged misconduct of a corporate officer as grounds for removal. *White v. Clevenger*, 71 N.M. 80, 376 P.2d 31 (1962).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto §§ 116 to 118.

74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto §§ 49, 50, 52.

§ 44-3-15. [Election contest statutes unaffected.]

This act [44-3-1 to 44-3-16 NMSA 1978] shall not be construed to in any way affect the provisions of the statutes now in force in relation to election contests.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 15; C.S. 1929, § 115-115; 1941 Comp., § 26-215; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-15.

Compiler's notes. - Provisions for election contests, when this section was enacted, were codified as 2066 to 2080, 1915 Code. These provisions were subsequently repealed by Laws 1927, ch. 41, § 722 (the 1927 Election Code which has subsequently been repealed). For present provisions as to contest, see 1-14-1 to 1-14-21 NMSA 1978.

Quo warranto is not cumulative remedy. - See same catchline in notes to 44-3-4 NMSA 1978 (IV).

Section superseded by former Election Code. - Provisions relating to contest of elections in 1927 Election Code enacted after this section sets up an exclusive remedy and supersedes the remedy by statutory quo warranto. *State ex rel. Abercrombie v. District Court*, 37 N.M. 407, 24 P.2d 265 (1933) (decided under former Election Code).

Statutory remedy for contesting elections to public office is exclusive. - See same catchline in notes to 44-3-4 NMSA 1978 (IV).

If other election provision applies, quo warranto not available. - See same catchline in notes to 44-3-4 IV NMSA 1978.

But it lies if no other statutory provision exists. - See same catchline in notes to 44-3-4 IV NMSA 1978.

§ 44-3-16. [Speedy hearing on appeal.]

In case of an appeal the supreme court shall advance the case on the docket of said court so as to obtain the most speedy hearing possible.

History: Laws 1919, ch. 28, § 16; C.S. 1929, § 115-116; 1941 Comp., § 26-216; 1953 Comp., § 22-15-16.

Cross-references. - As to appeals generally, see Rules 12-201 to 12-216 SCRA 1986.

Section presupposes a right to appeal. - Although this article (44-3-1 to 44-3-16 NMSA 1978) does not provide for an appeal, it presupposes an appeal under this section. State ex rel. Besse v. District Court, 31 N.M. 82, 239 P. 452 (1925).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 65 Am. Jur. 2d Quo Warranto § 124.
Determination of issues of fact involved in original quo warranto proceedings in appellate court, 98 A.L.R. 237.
74 C.J.S. Quo Warranto § 51.

Article 4

Actions Against Receivers

§ 44-4-1. [Employees of receivers entitled to compensation.]

Any person in the employ of and who has or may hereafter render any service for or on behalf of any receiver, or any estate in the hands of any receiver, shall receive reasonable compensation for the services rendered.

History: Laws 1917, ch. 72, § 1; C.S. 1929, § 105-2601; 1941 Comp., § 25-101; 1953 Comp., § 22-1-1.

Cross-references. - As to appointment of receivers, see Rule 1-066 SCRA 1986.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 66 Am. Jur. 2d Receivers §§ 321 to 329.
Allowance of wage claims of employees of operating receiver, 27 A.L.R. 720.
Allowance of attorney's fee against property or funds for services in aid of receiver, 107 A.L.R. 758.
Attorneys' fees incurred by the receiver whose appointment was improper as chargeable against estate, 4 A.L.R. 2d 178.
75 C.J.S. Receivers §§ 159, 160.

§ 44-4-2. [Action for compensation; consent of court.]

Any person entitled to any compensation as provided in Section one [44-4-1 NMSA 1978] of this act, is hereby authorized to institute suit against such receiver to recover the same after having first obtained the consent of the court to institute such suit.

History: Laws 1917, ch. 72, § 2; C.S. 1929, § 105-2602; 1941 Comp., § 25-102; 1953 Comp., § 22-1-2.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 66 Am. Jur. 2d Receivers §§ 322, 442, 465.
Failure to obtain permission to sue receiver as affecting jurisdiction of action, 29 A.L.R. 1460.
Contempt by action or suit against receiver without consent of court, 39 A.L.R. 8; 48 A.L.R. 241.
75 C.J.S. Receivers §§ 159, 160, 332, 333.

§ 44-4-3. [District court failing to give consent; application to supreme court.]

In case the district court shall refuse or fail to give its consent to the institution of an action, such as is provided for in Section two [44-4-2 NMSA 1978] of this act, the party desiring to institute such suit may apply to the supreme court for such permission which court may, upon good cause shown, grant such permission after which such suit may be brought and maintained.

History: Laws 1917, ch. 72, § 3; C.S. 1929, § 105-2603; 1941 Comp., § 25-103; 1953 Comp., § 22-1-3.

§ 44-4-4. [Receiver must retain funds to satisfy claim; preference.]

In case any suit is instituted under this act [44-4-1 to 44-4-5 NMSA 1978] the receiver shall retain in his hands sufficient funds to satisfy the claim sued for, and in case judgment is rendered for the plaintiff, the same shall be a preferred claim.

History: Laws 1917, ch. 72, § 4; C.S. 1929, § 105-2604; 1941 Comp., § 25-104; 1953 Comp., § 22-1-4.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 66 Am. Jur. 2d Receivers §§ 263, 485.
Discharge of receiver as affecting pending action against him or judgment therein, 112 A.L.R. 142.

Failure to restrain drunk driver as ground of liability of state or local government unit or officer, 48 A.L.R.4th 320.

75 C.J.S. Receivers § 362.

§ 44-4-5. [Procedure same as in civil actions.]

Cases brought under the provisions of this act [44-4-1 to 44-4-5 NMSA 1978] shall be governed by the same rules and laws as govern any ordinary civil actions.

History: Laws 1917, ch. 72, § 5; C.S. 1929, § 105-2605; 1941 Comp., § 25-105; 1953 Comp., § 22-1-5.

Cross-references. - See generally, Rules of Civil Procedure for District Courts in Judicial Pamphlet 1.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 66 Am. Jur. 2d Receivers §§ 476, 481.
75 C.J.S. Receivers §§ 348 to 355.

Article 5

Gambling Debts and Losses

§ 44-5-1. [Money and property losses; loser's right of action for recovery; nature of remedy.]

Any person who shall lose any money or property at any game at cards, or at any gambling device, may recover the same by action of debt, if money; if property, by action of trover, replevin or detinue.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 34; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 1; C.L. 1884, § 2290; C.L. 1897, § 3199; Code 1915, § 2507; C.S. 1929, § 58-101; 1941 Comp., § 25-1001; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-1.

Cross-references. - For criminal statutes with respect to gambling, see 30-19-1 to 30-19-14 NMSA 1978. For replevin generally, see 42-8-1 to 42-8-22 NMSA 1978.

These provisions were designed to discourage gambling. *Wolford v. Martinez*, 28 N.M. 622, 216 P. 499 (1923).

Courts will not aid the winner in the enforcement of contracts or in the recovery of money or property won through gambling devices, or wagers in violation of this section. *Appleton v. Maxwell*, 10 N.M. 748, 65 P. 158 (1901).

Recovery not barred because loser first suggested gaming. - The mere fact that plaintiff himself first suggested a game of poker does not deny him the benefit of this section. *Snure v. Skipworth*, 61 N.M. 340, 300 P.2d 792 (1956).

Coin flip to decide between two alternatives not gambling. - Agreement between vendor and purchaser of a mortgaged farm whereby a coin flip was used to determine whether or not purchase price would be reduced, but where regardless of outcome vendor would be relieved of obligation to pay penalty in the event that purchaser decided to pay off mortgage, was not void under the provisions of 44-5-1 and 44-5-4 NMSA 1978 as being arrived at through gambling. This was no evil in the use of such coin flip for the purpose of determining which alternative should be applicable. (Because 30-19-1 and 30-19-2 NMSA 1978 were not in effect at the time the agreement took place, the definitions of "bet" and "gambling device" as contained in those sections were not used in deciding this case); *Garvin v. Hudson*, 76 N.M. 403, 415 P.2d 369 (1966).

Bank on which debt payment check drawn is necessary party. - Bank as holder of the funds on which check in payment of an illegal gaming contract was drawn was a necessary party in proceeding brought by payee to cancel the check, as bank, had it cashed such check, would have been liable for the full amount. *Teaver v. Miller*, 53 N.M. 345, 208 P.2d 156 (1949).

When two or more confederate to "shear a lamb" at gaming, they render themselves jointly and severally liable under statutes such as this. *Snure v. Skipworth*, 61 N.M. 340, 300 P.2d 792 (1956).

Loss occurs when game played not at time of payment. - Where, in action to recover money lost at gambling device, it was in evidence that plaintiff did not settle the loss at the time of the play, but about six weeks later he gave a check which defendant cashed, the loss occurred at the time the game was played and not when the check was given or the money paid. *Mann v. Gordon*, 15 N.M. 652, 110 P. 1043 (1910).

Must prove defendant won and received payment through stakeholder. - In order to recover money under these provisions, it must be proved that defendant won said amount from the plaintiff and that he received said amount from the plaintiff through the stakeholder. *Armstrong v. Aragon*, 13 N.M. 19, 79 P. 291 (1905).

Winner's year-old losses to plaintiff cannot be set-off. - In action to recover money lost at gambling within one year prior to the bringing of the action, moneys won at gambling by plaintiff from defendant more than one year prior to the bringing of plaintiff's action

could not be pleaded as a set-off or counterclaim. *Mann v. Gordon*, 15 N.M. 652, 110 P. 1043 (1910).

Uniform Negotiable Instruments Law did not modify these provisions. - There is no repugnancy between this law and the Uniform Negotiable Instruments Law (since repealed) which was not intended to modify these provisions concerning gambling. *Farmers' State Bank v. Clayton Nat'l Bank*, 31 N.M. 344, 245 P. 543 (1925).

Law reviews. - For article, "Approaching Statutory Interpretation in New Mexico," see 8 *Nat. Resources J.* 689 (1968).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 Am. Jur. 2d Gambling §§ 212, 213.

Right to recover money which plaintiff placed in hands of an agent to be used for gambling purposes, 3 A.L.R. 1635.

Accountability to owner of one who receives funds for "bucket shop" transaction from third person acting without authority, 35 A.L.R. 427.

Recovery of losses on horse races, 45 A.L.R. 1003.

Margin transactions or dealings in futures as within statutes providing for recovery back of money paid on gaming consideration, 49 A.L.R. 1085.

Rights and remedies in respect of money in gambling machine or other receptacle, used in connection with gambling, seized by public authorities, 79 A.L.R. 1007.

Right of professional gambler in action by casual gambler to recover losses, to set off money lost by him to casual gambler, 88 A.L.R. 1078.

Violation of statute relating to bucket shops or bucket shop transactions as ground of action by customer or patron, 113 A.L.R. 853.

Statute permitting specified forms of betting as affecting civil action on wagering contract, 117 A.L.R. 835.

Gambler's right to recover money lost by him as including money belonging to others, 162 A.L.R. 1224.

Rights and remedies in respect of property pledged for payment of gambling debt, 172 A.L.R. 701.

Recovery of money or property lost through cheating or fraud in forbidden gambling or game, 39 A.L.R.2d 1213.

Right of owner to recover his money gambled away by another without authority, 44 A.L.R.2d 1242.

Right to recover money lent for gambling purposes, 53 A.L.R.2d 345.

Law or policy of forum against wagering transactions as precluding enforcement of claim based on gambling transaction valid under governing law, 71 A.L.R.3d 178.

38 C.J.S. Gaming §§ 35 to 37.

§ 44-5-2. [Contents of complaint.]

In such action it shall be sufficient for the plaintiff to declare generally as in actions for debt for money had and received for the plaintiff's use, or as in actions of trover or

detinue for a supposed finding and the detaining or converting the property of the plaintiff to the use of the defendant whereby an action hath accrued to the plaintiff.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 2; C.L. 1884, § 2291; C.L. 1897, § 3200; Code 1915, § 2508; C.S. 1929, § 58-102; 1941 Comp., § 25-1002; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-2.

Cross-references. - For the contents of a claim for relief, see Rule 1-008A SCRA.

Action is against party receiving thing wagered. - These provisions give a right of action not against the party theoretically winning the wager, but against one to whom the amount or thing wagered has been delivered. *Armstrong v. Aragon*, 13 N.M. 19, 79 P. 291 (1905).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 Am. Jur. 2d Gambling § 257.
38 C.J.S. Gaming §§ 55, 56.

§ 44-5-3. Action maintainable by spouse, children, heirs, executors, administrators and creditors or [of] loser.

The spouse, children, heirs, executors, administrators and creditors of the person losing may have the same remedy against the winner as provided in Sections 44-5-1 and 44-5-2 NMSA 1978.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 3; C.L. 1884, § 2292; C.L. 1897, § 3201; Code 1915, § 2509; C.S. 1929, § 58-103; 1941 Comp., § 25-1003; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-3; Laws 1973, ch. 59, § 1.

Law reviews. - For article, "Approaching Statutory Interpretation in New Mexico," see 8 Nat. Resources J. 689 (1968).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 Am. Jur. 2d Gambling §§ 226, 228.
Assignment of, or succession to, statutory right of action for recovery of money lost at gambling, 18 A.L.R.2d 999.
38 C.J.S. Gaming § 38.

§ 44-5-4. Judgments, conveyances and contracts founded on gambling loss void; suit to declare void; parties.

All judgments, securities, bonds, bills, notes or conveyances, when the consideration is money or property won at gambling, or at any game or gambling device, shall be void, and may be set aside or vacated by any court of equity upon a bill filed for that purpose, by the person so granting, giving, entering into or executing the same or by any creditor

or by his executors, administrators, or by any heir, purchaser or other persons interested therein; provided however, that the holder in due course of any such security, bond, bill or note which is otherwise negotiable holds such instrument free from any defect of title of prior parties, and free from defenses available to prior parties among themselves, and may enforce payment of such instrument for the full amount thereof against all parties liable thereon.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 4; C.L. 1884, § 2293; C.L. 1897, § 3202; Code 1915, § 2510; C.S. 1929, § 58-104; 1941 Comp., § 25-1004; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-4; Laws 1955, ch. 77, § 1.

Cross-references. - As to transfer and negotiation generally, see 55-3-201 to 55-3-208 NMSA 1978. As to holder in due course generally, see 55-3-301 to 55-3-307 NMSA 1978.

Emergency clauses. - Laws 1955, ch. 77, § 2, makes the act effective immediately. Approved March 4, 1955.

Party knowingly loaning money for gambling cannot recover by suit. - Where money is loaned or advanced with the understanding between the parties that it shall be used in gambling, or where the party advancing the money shares in the gambling transaction, such party becomes particeps criminis and cannot recover in suit for the money loaned or advanced. *Appleton v. Maxwell*, 10 N.M. 748, 65 P. 158 (1901).

"Gambling" not restricted to games of chance. - The word "gambling" is not restricted to wagering upon the result of any game of chance, but applies to wagering of all kinds, and there can be no doubt that a horse race is a gambling device when adopted for such purpose. *Joseph v. Miller*, 1 N.M. 621 (1876).

Coin flip to decide between two alternatives not gambling. - Agreement between vendor and purchaser of a mortgaged farm whereby a coin flip was used to determine whether or not purchase price would be reduced, but where regardless of outcome, vendor would be relieved of obligation to pay penalty in the event that purchaser decided to pay off mortgage, was not void under the provisions of 44-5-1 and 44-5-4 NMSA 1978 as being arrived at through gambling. This was no evil in the use of such coin flip for the purpose of determining which alternative should be applicable. (Because 30-19-1 and 30-19-2 NMSA 1978 were not in effect at the time the agreement took place, the definitions of "bet" and "gambling device" as contained in those sections were not used in deciding this case.); *Garvin v. Hudson*, 76 N.M. 403, 415 P.2d 369 (1966).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 Am. Jur. 2d Gambling §§ 207 to 211. Effect of Negotiable Instruments Act on statute invalidating instrument given for gambling consideration, 8 A.L.R. 314; 11 A.L.R. 211; 37 A.L.R. 698; 46 A.L.R. 959. Right of maker, or other party to transfer, to make the defense that paper was transferred on a gambling consideration, 56 A.L.R. 1322. 38 C.J.S. Gaming §§ 3, 20 to 28.

§ 44-5-5. [Defense in action by assignee.]

The assignment of any bond, bill, note, judgment, conveyance or other security, shall not affect the defense of the person executing the same.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 5; C.L. 1884, § 2294; C.L. 1897, § 3203; Code 1915, § 2511; C.S. 1929, § 58-105; 1941 Comp., § 25-1005; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-5.

Cross-references. - As to the rights of a transferee of a negotiable instrument, see 55-3-201 NMSA 1978. For the rights of a holder in due course, see 55-3-305 NMSA 1978. For the rights of one not a holder in due course, see 55-3-306 NMSA 1978.

Party knowingly loaning money for gambling cannot recover by suit. - See same catchline in notes to 44-5-4 NMSA 1978.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 Am. Jur. 2d Gambling §§ 208 to 210.

§ 44-5-6. [Loss by minor, servant or apprentice in grocery, store or dramshop; proprietor liable; who may sue.]

If any minor, servant or apprentice shall lose any money or property in any grocery, store or dramshop by betting at cards, or any other gambling device, or by any other bet, wager or hazard whatever, the father, mother, relations or guardian of such minor, or the master of such apprentice or servant may sue for and recover from the keeper of such grocery, store or dramshop, such money or property or the value thereof, so lost by such minor, apprentice or servant.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 6; C.L. 1884, § 2295; C.L. 1897, § 3204; Code 1915, § 2512; C.S. 1929, § 58-106; 1941 Comp., § 25-1006; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-6.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 Am. Jur. 2d Gambling § 234.

§ 44-5-7. [How defenses under this article may be asserted.]

Any matter of defense, under this chapter [44-5-1 to 44-5-14 NMSA 1978], may be specially pleaded, or given in evidence, under the general issue.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 7; C.L. 1884, § 2296; C.L. 1897, § 3205; Code 1915, § 2513; C.S. 1929, § 58-107; 1941 Comp., § 25-1007; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-7.

Meaning of "this chapter". - The term "this chapter" was substituted for the term "this act" by the 1915 Code compilers and refers to ch. 48 of the 1915 Code.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 Am. Jur. 2d Gambling §§ 257, 258.
38 C.J.S. Gaming § 57.

§ 44-5-8. [Suit before magistrate; interrogatories to defendant.]

In all suits, under this chapter [44-5-1 to 44-5-14 NMSA 1978], before a justice of the peace [magistrate], the plaintiff may call in the defendant to answer, on oath, any interrogatory touching the case, and if the defendant refuse to answer, the same shall be taken as confessed.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 8; C.L. 1884, § 2297; C.L. 1897, § 3206; Code 1915, § 2514; C.S. 1929, § 58-108; 1941 Comp., § 25-1008; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-8.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-5-7 NMSA 1978.

Office of justice of the peace abolished. - Laws 1968, ch. 62, § 40, abolishes the office of justice of the peace and provides that whenever the term "justice of the peace" occurs in the laws it shall be construed to refer to the magistrate court. See 35-1-38 NMSA 1978.

§ 44-5-9. [Answer to interrogatories not evidence in criminal prosecution.]

Such answer shall not be admitted against such person as evidence in any criminal proceeding.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 9; C.L. 1884, § 2298; C.L. 1897, § 3207; Code 1915, § 2515; C.S. 1929, § 58-109; 1941 Comp., § 25-1009; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-9.

§ 44-5-10. [Election bets included.]

Bets and wagers on an election authorized by the constitution and laws of the United States, or by the laws of this state, are gaming within the meaning of this chapter [44-5-1 to 44-5-14 NMSA 1978].

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 10; C.L. 1884, § 2299; C.L. 1897, § 3208; Code 1915, § 2516; C.S. 1929, § 58-110; 1941 Comp., § 25-1010; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-10.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-5-7 NMSA 1978.

Section applied to sheriff's election at general election. - This section applied to a bet or wager upon the result of the election of sheriff at a general election. *Armstrong v. Aragon*, 13 N.M. 19, 79 P. 291 (1905).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 C.J.S. Gaming § 86.

§ 44-5-11. [Stakeholder's liability; demand required.]

Every stakeholder who shall knowingly receive any money or property, staked upon any betting, declared gaming by the provisions of this chapter [44-5-1 to 44-5-14 NMSA 1978], shall be liable to the party who placed such money or property in his hands, both before and after the determination of such bet, and the delivery of the money or property to the winner shall be no defense to an action brought by the loser for the recovery thereof: provided, that no stakeholder shall be liable afterwards, unless a demand has been made upon such stakeholder for the money or property in his possession previous to the expiration of the time agreed upon by the parties for the determination of such bet or wager.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 11; C.L. 1884, § 2300; C.L. 1897, § 3209; Code 1915, § 2517; C.S. 1929, § 58-111; 1941 Comp., § 25-1011; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-11.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-5-7 NMSA 1978.

Public policy against gambling overrides rule preventing unjust enrichment. - The public policy of New Mexico is to restrain and discourage gambling and must override the rule which prevents unjust enrichment, particularly where there is a choice between that which is considered to be for the benefit of the public at large as distinguished from any benefit to an individual litigant. *Schnoor v. Griffin*, 79 N.M. 86, 439 P.2d 922 (1968).

Action cannot be maintained on contract that is illegal or against public policy, where both parties are equally culpable. *Schnoor v. Griffin*, 79 N.M. 86, 439 P.2d 922 (1968).

This section makes stakeholder liable for money placed in his hands "staked upon any betting." Where defendant was not a stakeholder - but a party to an illegal act - law will leave the parties where it found them. *Schnoor v. Griffin*, 79 N.M. 86, 439 P.2d 922 (1968).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 Am. Jur. 2d Gambling §§ 247, 248 to 250.

Recovery of amount of bet deposited with stakeholder, 8 A.L.R.2d 318 to 329.
38 C.J.S. Gaming § 39.

§ 44-5-12. [Garnishment against winner in action by creditor against loser.]

Any creditor to any person losing by any game at cards or any other gambling device, in addition to the remedy provided by the above sections of this chapter [44-5-1 to 44-5-14 NMSA 1978], shall have the right to garnishee the winner in any proceeding by attachment or execution, and the same proceeding shall be had thereon as if such winner were a debtor of the party losing to the amount of money, property, rights or credits, that may appear to have been so won by said winner from the party losing.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 36; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 12; C.L. 1884, § 2301; C.L. 1897, § 3210; Code 1915, § 2518; C.S. 1929, § 58-112; 1941 Comp., § 25-1012; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-12.

Cross-references. - For procedures in garnishment proceedings, see 35-12-1 to 35-12-19 NMSA 1978.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-5-7 NMSA 1978.

Law reviews. - For article, "Approaching Statutory Interpretation in New Mexico," see 8 Nat. Resources J. 689 (1968).

§ 44-5-13. [Time for commencing action.]

Any action for money or property brought under this chapter [44-5-1 to 44-5-14 NMSA 1978], shall be commenced within one year from the time such action accrued, and not afterwards.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 38; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 13; C.L. 1884, § 2302; C.L. 1897, § 3211; Code 1915, § 2519; C.S. 1929, § 58-113; 1941 Comp., § 25-1013; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-13.

Meaning of "this chapter". - See same catchline in notes to 44-5-7 NMSA 1978.

Losses over one-year old cannot be set-off. - In a suit brought to recover money lost at gambling within one year prior to the bringing of such action, moneys won at gambling by the plaintiff from the defendant more than one year prior to the commencement of action by the plaintiff to recover his losses cannot be pleaded as a set-off or

counterclaim to the original cause of action. Mann v. Gordon, 15 N.M. 652, 110 P. 1043 (1910).

Loss occurs at time game played, not when money paid. - Where, in action to recover money lost at gaming device, it was in evidence that the plaintiff did not settle the loss at the time of the play, but about six weeks later he gave a check which defendant cashed, the loss occurred at the time the game was played, and not when the check was given or the money paid. Mann v. Gordon, 15 N.M. 652, 110 P. 1043 (1910).

Objection to counterclaim barred by limitations sustained. - An objection to a counterclaim which pleaded a cause of action under the gaming statutes barred by the statutes of limitation was properly sustained. Mann v. Gordon, 15 N.M. 652, 110 P. 1043 (1910).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 38 Am. Jur. 2d Gambling §§ 238 to 243. Action to recover money or property lost and paid through gambling as affected by statute of limitations, 22 A.L.R.2d 1390. 38 C.J.S. Gaming § 53.

§ 44-5-14. Action for recovery; immunity.

All persons who shall claim money or property lost at gaming, or when said money or property may be claimed by his spouse, child, relation or friend, said person, although he may have gambled, is hereby exempted from the punishment imposed by the laws prohibiting and restraining gaming.

History: Laws 1856-1857, p. 38; C.L. 1865, ch. 36, § 14; C.L. 1884, § 2303; C.L. 1897, § 3212; Code 1915, § 2520; C.S. 1929, § 58-114; 1941 Comp., § 25-1014; 1953 Comp., § 22-10-14; Laws 1973, ch. 59, § 2.

Specific gambling penalty did not impliedly repeal this section. - Laws 1921, ch. 86 (since repealed) did not repeal by implication the exemption provision (this section) when it imposed a specific penalty for gambling. State v. Schwartz, 70 N.M. 436, 374 P.2d 418 (1962).

This statute (44-5-1 to 44-5-14 NMSA 1978) was designed to discourage gambling by depriving the person winning any of the things therein enumerated of any title thereto, and by providing the right to recover same. State v. Schwartz, 70 N.M. 436, 374 P.2d 418 (1962).

After gambling prosecution, person may not invoke these provisions. - The statute (44-5-1 to 44-5-14 NMSA 1978) imposes a duty upon one invoking it. It requires him to come forward, disclose and make known the criminal act by the filing of a civil action for recovery of his losses. He may not delay such disclosure until such time as he is

charged with the offense and then reap the benefits of the statute. *State v. Schwartz*, 70 N.M. 436, 374 P.2d 418 (1962).

Law reviews. - For article, "Approaching Statutory Interpretation in New Mexico," see 8 *Nat. Resources J.* 689 (1968).

Article 6

Declaratory Judgments

§ 44-6-1. Short title.

This act [44-6-1 to 44-6-15 NMSA 1978] may be cited as the "Declaratory Judgment Act."

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-4, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 1.

Cross-references. - As to procedure with respect to declaratory judgment, see Rule 1-057 SCRA.

Law reviews. - For survey, "Civil Procedure in New Mexico in 1975," see 6 *N.M. L. Rev.* 367 (1976).

For article, "Separation of Powers and the Judicial Rule-Making Power in New Mexico: The Need for Prudential Restraints," see 15 *N.M.L. Rev.* 407 (1985).

§ 44-6-2. Scope.

In cases of actual controversy, district courts within their respective jurisdictions shall have power to declare rights, status and other legal relations whether or not further relief is or could be claimed. No action or proceeding shall be open to objection on the ground that a declaratory judgment or decree is prayed for. The declaration may be either affirmative or negative in form and effect and shall have the force and effect of a final judgment or decree.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-5, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 2.

- I. General Consideration.
- II. Actual Controversy.
- III. Applicability.
- IV. Relationship to Other Actions.

I. General Consideration.

"Actual controversy" and "interested party" required. - Under this section's predecessor there must have been an "actual controversy" and an "interested party" petitioning for judgment. *State ex rel. Maloney v. Sierra*, 82 N.M. 125, 477 P.2d 301 (1970).

Controversy assuring concrete adverseness is key ingredient of standing. - The "gist of the question of standing" is whether the party seeking relief has alleged such personal stake in the outcome of the controversy as to assure the concrete adverseness which sharpens the presentation of issues upon which the court so largely depends for illumination of difficult constitutional questions. *State ex rel. Overton v. New Mexico State Tax Comm'n*, 81 N.M. 28, 462 P.2d 613 (1969).

Decision to accept declaratory judgment jurisdiction discretionary and reviewable. - Whether a court assumes, takes, entertains, accepts or exercises jurisdiction in a declaratory judgment action, or refuses so to do, it is acting within its discretionary power which is subject to review for an alleged abuse thereof. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Firemen's Ins. Co.*, 76 N.M. 430, 415 P.2d 553 (1966).

Determination of remedy may be had before hearing on merits. - Contention that it was mandatory on the district court to hear a case on the merits before it could exercise its discretion to determine whether a declaratory judgment was the appropriate remedy and whether a declaration should be granted or denied was without merit. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Firemen's Ins. Co.*, 76 N.M. 430, 415 P.2d 553 (1966).

Action contesting proposed expenditure's constitutionality not premature. - Because the bond issue money has not been raised, nor spent, does not make this a premature suit for declaratory judgment, seeking a declaration that proposed expenditure of money was unconstitutional. *Gomez v. Board of Educ.*, 83 N.M. 207, 490 P.2d 465 (1971).

Stipulation may supply absent allegations of answer. - Where an action for a declaratory judgment is submitted upon a stipulation that completely covers the case, then the matter of pleadings becomes immaterial and the fact that the pleadings contain no allegation upon a certain issue involved will not be considered. A stipulation may supply absent allegations of an answer. A stipulation may supply the failure to allege the amount involved, if such amount is contained in the stipulation itself. *Lyle v. Luna*, 65 N.M. 429, 338 P.2d 1060 (1959).

Question not pleaded but argued will be considered. - Where a controversial question was not pleaded but argued pro and con in briefs of the parties, the supreme court considers it in the same manner as a cause of action properly pleaded. *Laughlin v. Laughlin*, 49 N.M. 20, 155 P.2d 1010 (1944).

Dispute turning upon fact question still considered. - That the dispute turns upon question of fact does not withdraw it from judicial cognizance. *National Liberty Ins. Co. of Am. v. Silva*, 43 N.M. 283, 92 P.2d 161 (1939); *Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Haworth*, 300 U.S. 227, 57 S. Ct. 461, 81 L. Ed. 617 (1937).

Judgment not disturbed where evidence conflicts and corroboration available. - Where land had been left out of a deed by mutual mistake, a finding to that effect and a determination of the value of the land would not be disturbed on appeal, where the evidence adduced in the declaratory judgment suit was conflicting and corroboration on the part of a disinterested witness was available. *Collier v. Sage*, 51 N.M. 147, 180 P.2d 242 (1947).

Trial court may properly grant declaratory and nondeclaratory relief in a single action when such relief is requested in the pleadings by the parties. *Sunwest Bank v. Clovis IV*, 106 N.M. 149, 740 P.2d 699 (1987).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments §§ 1, 33, 35 to 40, 238 to 242.

Declaration of rights or declaratory judgments, 12 A.L.R. 52; 19 A.L.R. 1124; 50 A.L.R. 42; 68 A.L.R. 110; 87 A.L.R. 1205; 114 A.L.R. 1361; 142 A.L.R. 8.

Questions or controversy between public officers as within contemplation of Declaratory Judgment Act, 103 A.L.R. 1094.

Right to quiet title or remove cloud on title to personal property by suit in equity or under Declaratory Judgment Act, 105 A.L.R. 291.

Determination of constitutionality of statute or ordinance, or proposed statute or ordinance, as proper subject of judicial decision under Declaratory Judgment Act, 114 A.L.R. 1361.

Application of Declaratory Judgment Act to questions in respect of insurance policies, 123 A.L.R. 285.

Action under Declaratory Judgment Act to test validity or effect of a decree of divorce, 124 A.L.R. 1336.

Questions regarding rights of inheritance or other rights in respect of another's estate after death as proper subject of declaratory action before latter's death, 139 A.L.R. 1239.

Application of Declaratory Judgment Act to questions in respect of insurance policies, 142 A.L.R. 8.

Justiciable controversy within Declaratory Judgment Act as predicable upon advice, opinion or ruling of public administrative officer, 149 A.L.R. 349.

Statute of limitations or doctrine of laches in relation to declaratory actions, 151 A.L.R. 1076.

Validity and effect of former judgment or decree as proper subject for consideration in declaratory action, 154 A.L.R. 740.

May declaratory and coercive or executory relief be combined in action under Declaratory Judgment Act, 155 A.L.R. 501.

Release as proper subject of action for declaratory judgment, 167 A.L.R. 433.

Labor dispute as proper subject of declaratory action, 170 A.L.R. 421.

Custody of child as proper subject of declaratory action, 170 A.L.R. 521.
Right to declaratory relief as affected by existence of other remedy, 172 A.L.R. 847.
Determination of seniority rights of employee as proper subject of declaratory suit, 172 A.L.R. 1247.
Interest necessary to maintenance of declaratory determination of validity of statute or ordinance, 174 A.L.R. 549.
"Actual controversy" under declaratory judgment statute in building restriction cases, 174 A.L.R. 853.
Declaratory or advisory relief respecting future interest, 174 A.L.R. 880.
Declaratory judgments as to relief against covenant restricting right to engage in business or profession, 10 A.L.R.2d 743.
Extent to which res judicata principles apply to actions for declaratory relief, 10 A.L.R.2d 782.
Tax questions as proper subject of action for declaratory judgment, 11 A.L.R.2d 359.
Declaratory relief with respect to unemployment compensation, 14 A.L.R.2d 826.
Suspension or expulsion from social club or similar society and the remedies therefor, 20 A.L.R.2d 344.
Suspension or expulsion from church or religious society and the remedies therefor, 20 A.L.R.2d 421.
Suspension or expulsion from professional association and the remedies therefor, 20 A.L.R.2d 531.
Declaratory relief from expulsion from provisional association, 20 A.L.R.2d 573.
Remedy for refusal of corporation or its agent to register or effectuate transfer of stock, 22 A.L.R.2d 167.
Burden of proof in actions under general declaratory judgment acts, 23 A.L.R.2d 1243.
Negligence issue as a proper subject for declaratory judgment, 28 A.L.R.2d 957.
Declaratory judgments as to partnership or joint-venture matters, 32 A.L.R.2d 970.
Validity of lease of real property, 60 A.L.R.2d 400.
Declaratory judgment, during lifetime of spouses, as to construction of antenuptial agreement dealing with property rights of survivor, 80 A.L.R.2d 941.
Declaratory judgment to determine title or right to office in unincorporated private association, 82 A.L.R.2d 1172.
Declaratory judgment to determine validity or existence of common-law marriage, 92 A.L.R.2d 1102.
Availability and scope of declaratory judgment actions in determining rights of parties, or powers and exercise thereof by arbitrators, under arbitration agreements, 12 A.L.R.3d 854.
26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments §§ 1, 5, 24, 159.

II. Actual Controversy.

In order to confer jurisdiction on court to enter declaration an actual controversy must exist. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Firemen's Ins. Co.*, 76 N.M. 430, 415 P.2d 553 (1966); *Mowrer v. Rusk*, 95 N.M. 48, 618 P.2d 886 (1980).

An actual controversy must exist to confer jurisdiction. *Taos County Bd. of Educ. v. Sedillo*, 44 N.M. 300, 101 P.2d 1027 (1940).

Question must be real and real interests on both sides. - The only controversy necessary to invoke action of the court and have it declare rights under declaratory judgment provisions is that the question must be real, and not theoretical; the person raising it must have a real interest, and there must be someone having a real interest in the question who may oppose the declaration sought. *Taos County Bd. of Educ. v. Sedillo*, 44 N.M. 300, 101 P.2d 1027 (1940).

Remedy available if threat of unconstitutional deprivation of personal rights. - This remedy is only available under circumstances where one seeking relief is actually threatened with an unconstitutional deprivation of personal rights. *Balizer v. Shaver*, 82 N.M. 347, 481 P.2d 709 (Ct. App. 1971).

Prerequisites of "actual controversy" warranting consideration in declaratory judgment action are: a controversy involving rights or other legal relations of the parties seeking declaratory relief; a claim of right or other legal interest asserted against one who has an interest in contesting the claim; interests of the parties must be real and adverse; and the issue involved must be ripe for judicial determination. *Sanchez v. City of Santa Fe*, 82 N.M. 322, 481 P.2d 401 (1971).

Subject matter jurisdiction cannot be waived or conferred by consent. - There must be an "actual controversy" before jurisdiction is obtained. Jurisdiction of the subject matter cannot be conferred by consent of the parties, much less waived by them. Absent jurisdiction over the parties or absent the power or authority to decide the particular matter presented, and the lack of any essential element, is just as fatal to the judgment. If sensed by the court, even though not raised by the parties, the question of jurisdiction compels an answer. There must be a real and not a theoretical question, and the party raising it must have a real interest in the question before a declaratory judgment action will lie. *State ex rel. Overton v. New Mexico State Tax Comm'n*, 81 N.M. 28, 462 P.2d 613 (1969).

Actual controversy when administrative stalemate detrimental to public interest exists. - Where there was an administrative stalemate detrimental to public interest, in which attorney general claimed that entire chapter on liquor sales was unconstitutional contrary to assertion of director of department of alcoholic beverage control, and attorney general construed a separate chapter on liquor sales to allow sale of alcoholic beverages by the drink on Sundays but director denied such an interpretation, there existed an actual controversy between interested parties rendering suit proper for declaratory judgment relief even though a licensed dispenser of alcoholic beverages was not a party. *State ex rel. Maloney v. Sierra*, 82 N.M. 125, 477 P.2d 301 (1970).

Deprivation of constitutional rights and prior arrests create actual controversy. - Where complaint alleged that by the use of the color of city vagrancy ordinance, the defendants had deprived and threatened to deprive the plaintiffs of the constitutional privileges and

immunities granted to citizens of the United States, such language, coupled with the alleged facts relating to prior arrests of plaintiffs by defendants under vagrancy ordinance, adequately disclosed a fact situation from which it could properly be said that plaintiffs were actually threatened with deprivation of their personal constitutional rights, and consideration of the constitutionality of the ordinance under this section's predecessor was warranted as against the contention that no actual controversy was present, even where both named plaintiffs were acquitted of the charges of vagrancy by the municipal court. *Balizer v. Shaver*, 82 N.M. 347, 481 P.2d 709 (Ct. App. 1971).

Actual controversy where municipality requires and subdivider refuses. - In case where municipality required subdivider to pay a \$50.00 fee per lot to be used for subdivision maintenance and improvements, but the subdivider refused to do so, an actual controversy within the ambit of this section existed between the parties. *Sanchez v. City of Santa Fe*, 82 N.M. 322, 481 P.2d 401 (1971).

Determination of price is actual controversy. - The state highway commission can properly bring an action for declaratory judgment to determine the amount to be paid for sand and gravel removed for public highway purposes. The determination of price is an actual controversy as contemplated by the declaratory judgment law, and declaratory judgment is a proper means of resolving the questions. 1961-62 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 61-12.

III. Applicability.

Action lies to determine propriety of attorney general's action. - County board of education may properly file suit under this section's predecessor for a declaratory judgment as to the merits of refusal of attorney general to approve issuance of bonds for the purpose of erecting and furnishing school buildings in certain school districts. *Taos County Bd. of Educ. v. Sedillo*, 44 N.M. 300, 101 P.2d 1027 (1940).

To determine validity of ordinance. - An action to determine the validity of a municipal ordinance prohibiting the keeping of livestock in certain areas was brought under these provisions. *Mitchell v. City of Roswell*, 45 N.M. 92, 111 P.2d 41 (1941).

To determine corporation's rights under unauthorized contract. - Action to determine rights of corporation under a contract made by its general manager without authority was brought under this section's predecessor. *Burguete v. G.W. Bond & Bro. Mercantile Co.*, 43 N.M. 97, 85 P.2d 749 (1938).

To determine governmental agency's insurer's liability. - Where New Mexico department of highways was immune from suit when liability insurance did not cover auto collision for which recovery was sought, declaratory judgment against department's insurer as to coverage, absent which action against department was improper, was proper even

though no judgment had been obtained against department. *Baca v. New Mexico State Hwy. Dep't*, 82 N.M. 689, 486 P.2d 625 (Ct. App. 1971).

To determine whether insured destroyed own property. - Where liability of an insurer for destruction of property by fire depends upon the disputed fact of whether the insured burned his own property, a suit by the insurer under these provisions is authorized. *National Liberty Ins. Co. of Am. v. Silva*, 43 N.M. 283, 92 P.2d 161 (1939).

And to determine if wages paid according to bargaining agreement. - The president of a union has sufficient interest to bring suit for a declaratory judgment as to whether employer was required to pay employees, members of union, in accordance with scale set up in collective bargaining agreement. *Key v. George E. Breece Lumber Co.*, 45 N.M. 397, 115 P.2d 622 (1941).

IV. Relationship to Other Actions.

Main characteristic of declaratory judgment which distinguishes it from other judgments is the fact that it conclusively declares the preexisting rights of the litigants without the appendage of any coercive decree, and does not seek execution or performance from the defendant or opposing party, for no executory process follows as of course. *Savage v. Howell*, 45 N.M. 527, 118 P.2d 1113 (1940).

These provisions do not enlarge jurisdiction of courts over subject matter and parties, but provide an alternative means of presenting controversies to courts having jurisdiction thereof. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Firemen's Ins. Co.*, 76 N.M. 430, 415 P.2d 553 (1966).

Unless valid cause of action is stated under rules of substantive law, there can be no recourse to declaratory judgment procedure to reach the desired end. No new substantive rights were created by the Declaratory Judgment Act. *American Linen Supply of N.M., Inc. v. City of Las Cruces*, 73 N.M. 30, 385 P.2d 359 (1963).

Declaratory actions are governed by same limitations applicable to other forms of relief, since the nature of the right sued upon, and not the form of action or relief demanded, determines the applicability of the statute of limitations. *Taylor v. Lovelace Clinic*, 78 N.M. 460, 432 P.2d 816 (1967).

No cause of action where complaint seeks to obtain evidence. - Where complaint seeks the aid of the court to obtain evidence which plaintiff considers necessary to establish an asserted claim or cause of action, and the costs thereof be charged to defendants if plaintiff's position is found to be correct, even though the defendant has agreed to the test if no obligation to pay therefor is placed upon it, trial court was correct in sustaining the motion to dismiss since the complaint stated no cause of action cognizable under

this section's predecessor. *American Linen Supply of N.M., Inc. v. City of Las Cruces*, 73 N.M. 30, 385 P.2d 359 (1963).

Action not substitute for discovery procedures. - A declaratory judgment is not the proper means nor was it intended to provide a manner of developing proof otherwise not available. It is not a substitute for discovery procedures. It is designed for the determination of issues in recognized causes of action between parties in the light of evidence that each may present without any coercive decree being sought, at least in the first instance. *American Linen Supply of N.M., Inc. v. City of Las Cruces*, 73 N.M. 30, 385 P.2d 359 (1963).

Applicable prior determinations made by supreme court cannot be avoided by the expedient of seeking a declaratory judgment. *Collier v. Sage*, 51 N.M. 147, 180 P.2d 242 (1947).

Administrative remedies must be exhausted. - Where taxpayer does not make timely application for protest before state tax commission (now property tax division) prior to seeking a declaratory judgment in the courts, it is precluded from presenting the case to the courts for review. *Associated Petroleum Transp., Ltd. v. Shepard*, 53 N.M. 52, 201 P.2d 772 (1949).

§ 44-6-3. Definition.

As used in the Declaratory Judgment Act [44-6-1 to 44-6-15 NMSA 1978], "person" means any person, partnership, joint stock company, unincorporated association or society or municipal or other corporation of any character whatsoever.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-6, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 3.

§ 44-6-4. Power to construe.

Any person interested under a deed, will, written contract or other writings constituting a contract, or whose rights, status or other legal relations are affected by a statute, municipal ordinance, contract or franchise, may have determined any question of construction or validity arising under the instrument, statute, ordinance, contract or franchise and obtain a declaration of rights, status or other legal relations thereunder.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-7, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 4.

Action alleging proposed expenditure unconstitutional not premature. - Because the bond issue money has not been raised, nor spent, does not make this a premature suit for declaratory judgment, seeking a declaration that proposed expenditure of money was unconstitutional. *Gomez v. Board of Educ.*, 83 N.M. 207, 490 P.2d 465 (1971) (decided under former law).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments §§ 68 to 86.

Determination of constitutionality of statute or ordinance, or proposed statute or ordinance, as proper subject of judicial decision under Declaratory Judgment Act, 114 A.L.R. 1361.

Application of Declaratory Judgment Act to questions in respect of contracts or alleged contracts, 162 A.L.R. 756.

Interest necessary to maintenance of declaratory determination of validity of statute or ordinance, 174 A.L.R. 549.

"Actual controversy" under declaratory judgment statute in zoning and building restriction cases, 174 A.L.R. 853.

Tax questions as proper subject of action for declaratory judgment, 11 A.L.R.2d 359.

Validity, construction and application of criminal statutes or ordinances as proper subject for declaratory judgment, 10 A.L.R.3d 727.

26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments §§ 44 to 52.

§ 44-6-5. Contract construction.

A contract may be construed either before or after there has been a breach thereof.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-8, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 5.

Action alleging proposed expenditure unconstitutional not premature. - See same catchline in notes to 44-6-4 NMSA 1978.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments §§ 62 to 65.

26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments §§ 53 to 59.

§ 44-6-6. Enumeration not exclusive.

The enumeration in Sections 4 [44-6-4 NMSA 1978] and 5 [44-6-5 NMSA 1978] of the Declaratory Judgment Act does not limit or restrict the exercise of the general powers conferred in Section 2 [44-6-2 NMSA 1978], in any proceeding where declaratory relief is sought, in which a judgment or decree will terminate the controversy or remove an uncertainty.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-9, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 6.

§ 44-6-7. Discretionary.

The court may refuse to render or enter a declaratory judgment or decree where such

judgment or decree, if rendered or entered, would not terminate the uncertainty or controversy giving rise to the proceeding.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-10, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 7.

Decision to accept declaratory judgment jurisdiction discretionary and reviewable. - See same catchline in notes to 44-6-2(I) NMSA 1978 (case was decided under former law).

Discretion must be based on good reason. - The exercise of discretion to grant or refuse declaratory relief under this section must find its basis in good reason. *Sunwest Bank v. Clovis IV*, 106 N.M. 149, 740 P.2d 699 (1987).

Disputed interpretation of arbitration contract. - Where a complaint for declaratory judgment raises questions of law arising from the disputed interpretation of an arbitration contract, the proper forum for resolution of such questions is the trial court. *Guaranty Nat'l Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 107 N.M. 764, 764 P.2d 1322 (1988).

Discretion held not to have been abused. - The trial court is vested with broad discretion to grant or refuse claims for declaratory relief, and where a ruling that there existed full legal and public access to plaintiff's property would not have terminated the controversy giving rise to the action, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in refusing to rule on the matter. *Colborne v. Village of Corrales*, 106 N.M. 103, 739 P.2d 972 (1987).

Determination of remedy may be had before hearing on merits. - See same catchline in notes to 44-6-2 I NMSA 1978 (case was decided under former law).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments §§ 17 to 22.

26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments §§ 11, 12.

§ 44-6-8. Review.

All orders, judgments and decrees under the Declaratory Judgment Act [44-6-1 to 44-6-15 NMSA 1978] may be reviewed as other order [orders], judgments and decrees.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-11, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 8.

Cross-references. - As to appeals generally, see Rules 12-201 to 12-216 SCRA 1986.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 4 Am. Jur. 2d Appeal and Error § 119; 5 Am. Jur. 2d Appeal and Error § 872.

26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments § 163.

§ 44-6-9. Supplemental relief.

Further relief based on a declaratory judgment or decree may be granted whenever necessary or proper. The application therefor shall be by petition to a court having jurisdiction to grant the relief. If the application be deemed sufficient, the court shall, on reasonable notice, require any adverse party whose rights have been adjudicated by the declaratory judgment or decree, to show cause why further relief should not be granted forthwith.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-12, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 9.

Supplemental relief available on showing of need to complete relief. - Supplemental relief to a declaratory judgment whenever necessary or proper may only be entered after an order to show cause, and then upon a determination that it should be granted to complete the relief declared. *State ex rel. Bingaman v. Valley Sav. & Loan Ass'n*, 97 N.M. 8, 636 P.2d 279 (1981).

Declaratory and nondeclaratory relief in single action. - The trial court may properly grant declaratory and nondeclaratory relief in a single action when such relief is requested in the pleadings by the parties. *State ex rel. Bardacke v. New Mexico Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n*, 102 N.M. 673, 699 P.2d 604 (1985).

Pending appeal, a trial court retains jurisdiction to enforce an un-superseded judgment. *United Nuclear Corp. v. General Atomic Co.*, 98 N.M. 633, 651 P.2d 1277 (1982), cert. denied, 460 U.S. 1017, 103 S. Ct. 1262, 75 L. Ed. 2d 488 (1983).

Court may provide for future proceedings to enforce right declared. - In action under this section's predecessor, the court found that the debt due by plaintiffs to defendant had not been canceled, found the amounts thereof and the nature of the security and provision was made for future proceedings to enforce the rights declared by appropriate remedy. *Burguete v. G.W. Bond & Bro. Mercantile Co.*, 43 N.M. 97, 85 P.2d 749 (1938) (decision under former, similar provision).

Declaratory judgment declares preexisting rights without coercive decree. - The principal characteristic of the declaratory judgment which distinguishes it from other judgments is that it declares preexisting rights of the parties without a coercive decree. Execution or performance by the opposing parties does not follow as a matter of course. *Pan Am. Petroleum Corp. v. El Paso Natural Gas Co.*, 77 N.M. 481, 424 P.2d 397 (1966).

When necessary or proper coercive decree could be entered. - This section's predecessor did authorize the court, when necessary or proper, to grant complete relief and to enter a coercive decree to carry the declaratory judgment into effect. *Pan Am. Petroleum Corp. v. El Paso Natural Gas Co.*, 77 N.M. 481, 424 P.2d 397 (1966).

Coercive decree granted on showing of need to complete relief. - A coercive decree may only be entered after an order to show cause, and then upon a determination that it

should be granted to complete the relief declared. *Pan Am. Petroleum Corp. v. El Paso Natural Gas Co.*, 77 N.M. 481, 424 P.2d 397 (1966).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments § 243.

Decree or order which merely declares rights of parties without an express command or prohibition as basis of contempt proceeding, 29 A.L.R. 134.

Remedy or procedure to make effective rights established by declaratory judgment, 101 A.L.R. 689.

May declaratory and coercive or executory relief be combined in action under Declaratory Judgment Act, 155 A.L.R. 501.

26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments § 162.

§ 44-6-10. Jury trial.

When a proceeding under the Declaratory Judgment Act [44-6-1 to 44-6-15 NMSA 1978] involves the determination of an issue of fact, the issue may be tried and determined in the same manner as issues of fact are tried and determined in other civil actions in the court in which the proceeding is pending.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-13, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 10.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments §§ 228, 230.

Jury trial in action for declaratory relief, 131 A.L.R. 218; 13 A.L.R.2d 777.

Right to jury trial in action for declaratory relief in state court, 33 A.L.R.4th 146.

26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments §§ 155, 156.

§ 44-6-11. Costs.

In any proceeding under the Declaratory Judgment Act [44-6-1 to 44-6-15 NMSA 1978], the court may make an award of costs as may seem equitable and just.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-14, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 11.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments § 253.

§ 44-6-12. Parties.

When declaratory relief is sought, all persons shall be made parties who have or claim any interest which would be affected by the declaration, and no declaration shall prejudice the rights of persons not parties to the proceeding. In any proceeding which

involves the validity of a municipal ordinance or franchise, the municipality shall be made a party and shall be entitled to be heard, and if the statute, ordinance or franchise is alleged to be unconstitutional, the attorney general shall also be served with a copy of the proceeding and be entitled to be heard.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-15, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 12.

Attorney general to be served where constitutionality of statute questioned. - This section requires service upon the attorney general not only when it is alleged that a statute, on its face, is unconstitutional but also where the statute is alleged to be unconstitutional in its application to a particular person. *Lazo v. Board of County Comm'rs*, 102 N.M. 35, 690 P.2d 1029 (1984).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments §§ 203, 204, 209 to 211.

Joinder of causes of action and parties in suit under Declaratory Judgment Act, 110 A.L.R. 817.

Construction, application and effect of § 11 of the Uniform Declaratory Judgments Act that all persons who have or claim any interest which would be affected by the declaration shall be made parties, 71 A.L.R.2d 723.

26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments §§ 121, 130, 131, 132.

§ 44-6-13. State or official may be sued; construction of constitution or statute.

For the purpose of the Declaratory Judgment Act [44-6-1 to 44-6-15 NMSA 1978], the state of New Mexico, or any official thereof, may be sued and declaratory judgment entered when the rights, status or other legal relations of the parties call for a construction of the constitution of the state of New Mexico, the constitution of the United States or any of the laws of the state of New Mexico or the United States, or any statute thereof.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-16, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 13.

Cross-references. - For declaratory judgment proceedings where state a party, see Rule 1-057B SCRA 1986.

This section's predecessor was not a general consent by state to be sued. *Taos County Bd. of Educ. v. Sedillo*, 44 N.M. 300, 101 P.2d 1027 (1940).

State's consent to sue must otherwise exist. - It could be argued that this section's predecessor was a general consent on the part of the state to be sued under its provisions. However, it has no such meaning and has no greater effect, insofar as this consideration is concerned, than merely to permit parties to sue the state under the act

where the state's consent to be sued otherwise exists and the facts warrant suit. In re Will of Bogert, 64 N.M. 438, 329 P.2d 1023 (1958).

And the facts must justify the suit. - Under this section's predecessor parties could sue the state only in those situations where the state's consent to be sued otherwise already existed and the facts justified the suit, and it did not provide for a general consent to be sued under the Declaratory Judgment Act. Arnold v. State, 48 N.M. 596, 154 P.2d 257 (1944).

Statutes which authorize suits against state must be construed strictly and where a suit to declare a statute unconstitutional is brought against the state it must be dismissed in the absence of express statutory authority for bringing it. Arnold v. State, 48 N.M. 596, 154 P.2d 257 (1944).

Where mandamus and prohibition lie declaratory judgment also issues. - Where other remedies such as mandamus or prohibition will lie against a state agency, declaratory judgment should also issue and would not be an enlargement of actions against the state. Harriett v. Lusk, 63 N.M. 383, 320 P.2d 738 (1958).

Actual controversy when administrative stalemate detrimental to public interest exists. - See same catchline in notes to 44-6-2(II) NMSA 1978 (case decided under former law).

Injured party has standing to sue under Declaratory Judgment Act on any genuine question involving the constitutionality or construction of a statute. Harriett v. Lusk, 63 N.M. 383, 320 P.2d 738 (1958).

Administrative remedies must be exhausted before action lies. - Where taxpayer does not make timely application for protest before state tax commission (now property tax division) prior to seeking a declaratory judgment in the courts, it is precluded from presenting the case to the courts for review. Associated Petroleum Transp., Ltd. v. Shepard, 53 N.M. 52, 201 P.2d 772 (1949).

Opinion not precedent on justiciable controversy issue if not presented. - When the jurisdiction of the court to render a declaratory judgment has not been questioned for want of a justiciable controversy, but might have been, the opinion of the supreme court is not stare decisis on the question whether such controversy is presented. Taos County Bd. of Educ. v. Sedillo, 44 N.M. 300, 101 P.2d 1027 (1940).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments §§ 68 to 70, 209, 210.

Federal question jurisdiction in declaratory judgment suit challenging state statute or regulation on grounds of federal preemption, 69 A.L.R. Fed. 753.
26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments §§ 44 to 47, 130.

§ 44-6-14. Construction.

The Declaratory Judgment Act [44-6-1 to 44-6-15 NMSA 1978] is declared to be remedial. The act's purpose is to settle and to afford relief from uncertainty and insecurity with respect to rights, status and other legal relations, and is to be liberally construed and administered.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-17, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 14.

Actions not intended as substitute for mandamus. - Declaratory judgment actions are not intended to provide a substitute for other available actions, such as mandamus. A mandamus will not be denied on the ground that the plaintiff did not bring a declaratory judgment action. *City of Albuquerque v. Ryon*, 106 N.M. 600, 747 P.2d 246 (1987).

Law reviews. - For survey, "Civil Procedure in New Mexico in 1975," see 6 N.M. L. Rev. 367 (1976).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 22A Am. Jur. 2d Declaratory Judgments §§ 7 to 10.

26 C.J.S. Declaratory Judgments §§ 3, 7, 8, 9.

§ 44-6-15. Uniformity of interpretation.

The Declaratory Judgment Act [44-6-1 to 44-6-15 NMSA 1978] shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of those states which enact it, and to harmonize, as far as possible, with federal laws and regulations on the subject of declaratory judgments and decrees.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-6-18, enacted by Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 15.

Emergency clauses. - Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 18, makes the Declaratory Judgment Act effective immediately. Approved April 10, 1975.

Severability clauses. - Laws 1975, ch. 340, § 17, provides for the severability of the Declaratory Judgment Act, except for sections 2 and 4 (44-6-2 and 44-6-4 NMSA 1978), if any part or application thereof is held invalid.

Law reviews. - For survey, "Civil Procedure in New Mexico in 1975," see 6 N.M. L. Rev. 367 (1976).

Article 7

Arbitration

§ 44-7-1. Validity of arbitration agreement.

A written agreement to submit any existing controversy to arbitration or a provision in a written contract to submit to arbitration any controversy thereafter arising between the parties is valid, enforceable and irrevocable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract. The Uniform Arbitration Act [44-7-1 to 44-7-22 NMSA 1978] also applies to arbitration agreements between employers and employees or between their respective representatives unless otherwise provided in the agreement.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-9, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 1.

Legislative intent in enacting Uniform Arbitration Act and the policy of the courts in enforcing it is to reduce caseloads in the courts, not only by allowing arbitration, but also by requiring controversies to be resolved by arbitration where contracts or other documents so provide. Dairyland Ins. Co. v. Rose, 92 N.M. 527, 591 P.2d 281 (1979); Daniels Ins. Agency, Inc. v. Jordan, 99 N.M. 297, 657 P.2d 624 (1982).

Intent of section. - Legislative history of 66-5-303 NMSA 1978 and the New Mexico Uniform Arbitration Act, lends support to the view that the latter is intended to supersede 66-5-303 NMSA 1978, the de novo trial provision of the uninsured motorist insurance law. Dairyland Ins. Co. v. Rose, 92 N.M. 527, 591 P.2d 281 (1979).

Uniform Arbitration Act supersedes conflicting common-law authority. Andrews v. Stearns-Roger, Inc., 93 N.M. 527, 602 P.2d 624 (1979).

In New Mexico, arbitration proceedings and awards are governed both by common law and by the Uniform Arbitration Act, but provisions of the act govern where the act conflicts with the common law. Daniels Ins. Agency, Inc. v. Jordan, 99 N.M. 297, 657 P.2d 624 (1982).

Announced policy of New Mexico favors and encourages arbitration as a means of conserving the time and resources of the courts and the contracting parties, and to this end the legislature has assigned the courts a minimal role in supervising arbitration practice and procedures. K.L. House Constr. Co. v. City of Albuquerque, 91 N.M. 492, 576 P.2d 752 (1978); Bernalillo County Medical Center Employees' Ass'n Local 2370 v. Cancelosi, 92 N.M. 307, 587 P.2d 960 (1978).

Unlicensed business cannot compel arbitration. - Texas corporations unauthorized to do business in New Mexico were unable to compel two dentists to arbitrate a dispute arising from an alleged breach of architectural and construction contracts for the construction of dental offices because a suit to compel arbitration is essentially a suit for specific performance and the corporations, not licensed to do business in New Mexico, cannot perform. Shaw v. Kuhnel & Assocs., 102 N.M. 607, 698 P.2d 880 (1985).

Arbitration agreement to be interpreted by rules of contract law. - The terms of the arbitration agreement are to be interpreted by the rules of contract law. *Christmas v. Cimarron Realty Co.*, 98 N.M. 330, 648 P.2d 788 (1982).

Both statutory and common-law arbitration exist without conflict. - Since nothing is said in these provisions that common-law arbitrations are abolished, both methods of arbitration may exist, one under the statute and the other under the common law without conflicting with each other. *Robinson v. Navajo Freight Lines*, 70 N.M. 215, 372 P.2d 801 (1962) (decision under former law).

Agreement defines scope of jurisdiction of arbitration. - Parties contracting to resolve disputes by arbitration are bound by their agreement. The terms of the agreement define the scope of the jurisdiction, conditions, limitations and restrictions on the matters to be arbitrated. *Christmas v. Cimarron Realty Co.*, 98 N.M. 330, 648 P.2d 788 (1982).

Arbitration agreement will be given broad interpretation. - When the parties agree to arbitrate any potential claims or disputes arising out of their relationships by contract or otherwise, the arbitration agreement will be given broad interpretation, unless the parties themselves limit arbitration to specific areas or matters. Barring such limiting language, the courts only decide the threshold question of whether there is an agreement to arbitrate. *K.L. House Constr. Co. v. City of Albuquerque*, 91 N.M. 492, 576 P.2d 752 (1978).

Forum for resolution of disputed interpretation. - Where a complaint for declaratory judgment raises questions of law arising from the disputed interpretation of an arbitration contract, the proper forum for resolution of such questions is the trial court. *Guaranty Nat'l Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 107 N.M. 764, 764 P.2d 1322 (1988).

Decision of joint committee subject to same standards as arbitrator's award. - Where the parties voluntarily submit a grievance to a joint management union committee for decision, the decision of that committee is subject to and governed by the same standards as an arbitrator's award, and is to be accorded the same finality. *Andrews v. Stearns-Roger, Inc.*, 93 N.M. 527, 602 P.2d 624 (1979).

When trial court determines force of disputed contract. - When a petition is filed to compel arbitration pursuant to a contract's arbitration clause and the responding party denies the existence or validity of the contract, the trial court must determine whether the contract is still in force to compel the requested arbitration. *Gonzales v. United S.W. Nat'l Bank*, 93 N.M. 522, 602 P.2d 619 (1979).

Arbitrators need not be sworn at common law. *Robinson v. Navajo Freight Lines*, 70 N.M. 215, 372 P.2d 801 (1962) (decision under former law).

Waiver of swearing if party participates without objection. - A party participating without objection in a hearing before an arbitrator who was not sworn constitutes a waiver of the

right to insist upon the oath. *Robinson v. Navajo Freight Lines*, 70 N.M. 215, 372 P.2d 801 (1962) (decision under former law).

Law reviews. - For note, "Uninsured Motorist Arbitration," see 3 N.M. L. Rev. 220 (1973).

For article, "The Contract to Arbitrate Future Disputes: A Comparison of the New Mexico Act with the New York and Federal Acts," see 9 N.M.L. Rev. 71 (1978-79).

For article, "Arbitration of Domestic Relations Disputes in New Mexico," see 16 N.M.L. Rev. 321 (1986).

For survey of construction law in New Mexico, see 18 N.M.L. Rev. 331 (1988).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 6 to 8, 10 to 13.

Partner's personal liability who, in firm name, without authority, agrees to arbitrate, 4 A.L.R. 260.

Validity of agreements to arbitrate disputes generally as a condition precedent to the bringing of an action, 26 A.L.R. 1077.

Renewal of lease at rent to be fixed by arbitration, validity of provision for, 30 A.L.R. 580; 68 A.L.R. 159; 166 A.L.R. 1245.

Power of municipal corporation to submit to arbitration, 40 A.L.R. 1370.

Arbitration agreement made pending action, 42 A.L.R. 727.

Injunction in labor dispute as affected by refusal to arbitrate, 66 A.L.R. 1091.

Constitutionality of compulsory arbitration or appraisal provision of standard policy, 77 A.L.R. 619.

Right of stockholder entitled to payment for his stock on merger or consolidation of corporation to compel arbitration of question of value, 87 A.L.R. 601.

Right of plaintiff to take voluntary dismissal or nonsuit after case has been submitted to arbitrator by agreement, 89 A.L.R. 99.

Severability of invalid arbitration provisions of contract, 90 A.L.R. 1305.

Arbitration proceeding as affecting mechanics' lien or liability of surety on owner's bond for discharge of lien, or on contractor's bond, 93 A.L.R. 1151.

Arbitration of issues or questions pertaining to probate matters, 104 A.L.R. 359.

Waiver of arbitration provision in contract, 117 A.L.R. 301; 161 A.L.R. 1426.

Validity of agreement to submit all future questions to arbitration, 135 A.L.R. 79.

Construction of arbitration provisions of sales contracts as regards questions to be submitted to arbitrators, 136 A.L.R. 364.

Arbitration provisions of contract as available to or against assignee, 142 A.L.R. 1092.

Claims based on provisions of statutes relating specifically to rights, duties and obligations between employer and employee as subject to arbitration provisions of contracts or statutes, 149 A.L.R. 276.

Contractual provision for determination by arbitrators of the price to be paid for property, or amount of damages for breach, as contemplating formal arbitration or the individual judgment of the arbitrators, 157 A.L.R. 1286.

Matters arbitrable under arbitration provisions of collective labor contract, 24 A.L.R.2d 752.

Arbitration provisions of employment contract providing for severance or dismissal pay, 40 A.L.R.2d 1052.

Contract providing that it is governed by or subject to rules or regulations of a particular trade, business or association as incorporating agreement to arbitrate, 41 A.L.R.2d 872.

Constitutionality of compulsory arbitration statutes, 55 A.L.R.2d 432.

Arbitration of disputes within close corporation, 64 A.L.R.2d 643.

Power of president of corporation to commence or to carry on arbitration proceedings, 65 A.L.R.2d 1321.

Dissolved corporation's power to participate in arbitration proceedings, 71 A.L.R.2d 1121.

Agreement to arbitrate future controversies as binding on infants, 78 A.L.R.2d 1292.

Covenant in lease to arbitrate, or to submit to appraisal, as running with the leasehold so as to bind assignee, 81 A.L.R.2d 804.

Availability and scope of declaratory judgment actions in determining rights of parties, or powers and exercise thereof by arbitrators, under arbitration agreements, 12 A.L.R.3d 854.

Validity and effect, and remedy in respect, of contractual stipulation to submit disputes to arbitration in another jurisdiction, 12 A.L.R.3d 892.

Validity and construction of provision for arbitration of disputes as to alimony or support payments, or child visitation or custody matters, 18 A.L.R.3d 1264.

Municipal corporation's power to submit to arbitration, 20 A.L.R.3d 569.

Validity and enforceability of provision for binding arbitration, and waiver thereof, 24 A.L.R.3d 1325.

Delay in asserting contractual right to arbitration as precluding enforcement thereof, 25 A.L.R.3d 1171.

Breach or repudiation of collective labor contract as subject to, or as affecting right to enforce, arbitration provision in contract, 29 A.L.R.3d 688.

Breach or repudiation of contract as affecting right to enforce arbitration clause therein, 32 A.L.R.3d 377.

Participation in arbitration proceedings as waiver of objections to arbitrability, 33 A.L.R.3d 1242.

Statute of limitations as bar to arbitration under agreement, 94 A.L.R.3d 522.

Conflict of laws as to validity and effect of arbitration provision in contract for purchase or sale of goods, products, or services, 95 A.L.R.3d 1145.

Defendant's participation in action as waiver of right to arbitration of dispute involved therein, 98 A.L.R.3d 767.

Claim of fraud in inducement of contract as subject to compulsory arbitration clause contained in contract, 11 A.L.R.4th 774.

Liability of organization sponsoring or administering arbitration to parties involved in proceeding, 41 A.L.R.4th 1013.

Attorney's submission of dispute to arbitration, or amendment of arbitration agreement, without client's knowledge or consent, 48 A.L.R.4th 127.

6 C.J.S. Arbitration §§ 4, 15, 17.

§ 44-7-2. Proceedings to compel or stay arbitration.

A. On application of a party showing an agreement described in Section 1 [44-7-1 NMSA 1978] and the opposing party's refusal to arbitrate, the court shall order the parties to proceed with arbitration, but if the opposing party denies the existence of the agreement to arbitrate, the court shall proceed summarily to the determination of the issue so raised and shall order arbitration if found for the moving party, otherwise, the application shall be denied.

B. On application, the court may stay an arbitration proceeding commenced or threatened on a showing that there is no agreement to arbitrate. Such an issue, when in substantial and bona fide dispute, shall be forthwith and summarily tried and the stay ordered if found for the moving party. If found for the opposing party, the court shall order the parties to proceed to arbitration.

C. If an issue referable to arbitration under the alleged agreement is involved in an action or proceeding pending in a court having jurisdiction to hear applications under Subsection A of this section, the application shall be made therein. Otherwise and subject to Section 18 [44-7-18 NMSA 1978], the application may be made in any court of competent jurisdiction.

D. Any action or proceeding involving an issue subject to arbitration shall be stayed if an order for arbitration or an application therefor has been made under this section or, if the issue is severable, the stay may be with respect thereto only. When the application is made in such action or proceeding, the order for arbitration shall include such stay.

E. An order for arbitration shall not be refused on the ground that the claim in issue lacks merit or bona fides or because any fault or grounds for the claim sought to be arbitrated have not been shown.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-10, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 2.

Valid arbitration defense does not divest the court of jurisdiction and is not properly raised by a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. When parties have agreed to arbitrate, however, a court should order arbitration. Daniels Ins. Agency, Inc. v. Jordan, 99 N.M. 297, 657 P.2d 624 (1982).

Role of court. - Under this section, it is the court's duty to order arbitration where provision for it is clear. Where provision for arbitration is disputed, the court's function is to determine whether there is an agreement to arbitrate and to order arbitration where an agreement to arbitrate is found. Bernalillo County Medical Center Employees' Ass'n Local 2370 v. Cancelosi, 92 N.M. 307, 587 P.2d 960 (1978).

No judicial power to compel consolidated arbitration. - Absent express statutory authorization or agreement of all concerned parties, district court had no power to

compel consolidated arbitration. *Pueblo of Laguna v. Cillessen & Son*, 101 N.M. 341, 682 P.2d 197 (1984).

When trial court determines force of disputed contract. - When a petition is filed to compel arbitration pursuant to a contract's arbitration clause and the responding party denies the existence or validity of the contract, the trial court must determine whether the contract is still in force to compel the requested arbitration. *Gonzales v. United S.W. Nat'l Bank*, 93 N.M. 522, 602 P.2d 619 (1979).

Right to arbitration not waived. - Where between the date a complaint was filed and the date a motion for arbitration was filed, the only pleadings filed were: (1) a complaint; (2) a motion to dismiss; (3) a first amended complaint; and (4) a motion requesting the trial court to submit the issues to arbitration, the case was not at issue and the right to arbitration had not been waived. *Bernalillo County Medical Center Employees' Ass'n Local 2370 v. Cancelosi*, 92 N.M. 307, 587 P.2d 960 (1978).

Nor by mere filing of complaint. - When the demand for arbitration follows initiation of proceedings in court, going to the merits of the dispute, a question of waiver is sometimes raised, but the mere filing of a complaint does not constitute a waiver of a right to arbitration. *Bernalillo County Medical Center Employees' Ass'n Local 2370 v. Cancelosi*, 92 N.M. 307, 587 P.2d 960 (1978).

Unlicensed business cannot compel arbitration. - Texas corporations unauthorized to do business in New Mexico were unable to compel two dentists to arbitrate a dispute arising from an alleged breach of architectural and construction contracts for the construction of dental offices because a suit to compel arbitration is essentially a suit for specific performance and the corporations, not licensed to do business in New Mexico, cannot perform. *Shaw v. Kuhnel & Assocs.*, 102 N.M. 607, 698 P.2d 880 (1985).

Fraud in the inducement not issue for arbitrator. - It is for a court to determine issues of fraud in the inducement of a contract, not an arbitrator; if no fraud is found, the remaining issues can proceed to arbitration. *Shaw v. Kuhnel & Assocs.*, 102 N.M. 607, 698 P.2d 880 (1985).

Law reviews. - For article, "The Contract to Arbitrate Future Disputes: A Comparison of the New Mexico Act with the New York and Federal Acts," see 9 N.M.L. Rev. 71 (1978-79).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 74, 75, 78, 80, 83.

Statute of limitations as bar to arbitration under agreement, 94 A.L.R.3d 522.

Defendant's participation in action as waiver of right to arbitration of dispute involved therein, 98 A.L.R.3d 767.

6 C.J.S. Arbitration §§ 30 to 32, 35, 36, 45, 46.

§ 44-7-3. Appointment of arbitrators by court.

If the arbitration agreement provides a method of appointment of arbitrators, this method shall be followed. In the absence thereof, or if the agreed method fails or for any reason cannot be followed, or when an arbitrator appointed fails or is unable to act and his successor has not been duly appointed, the court on application of a party shall appoint one or more arbitrators. An arbitrator so appointed has all the powers of one specifically named in the agreement.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-11, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 3.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 86 to 88.

Validity and effect of arbitration agreement provision that, upon one party's failure to appoint arbitrator, controversy may be determined by arbitrator appointed by other party, 47 A.L.R.2d 1346.

Liability of organization sponsoring or administering arbitration to parties involved in proceeding, 41 A.L.R.4th 1013.

6 C.J.S. Arbitration §§ 60, 61.

§ 44-7-4. Majority action by arbitrators.

The powers of the arbitrators may be exercised by a majority unless otherwise provided by the agreement or by the Uniform Arbitration Act [44-7-1 to 44-7-22 NMSA 1978].

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-12, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 4.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award § 132.
6 C.J.S. Arbitration § 90.

§ 44-7-5. Hearing.

Unless otherwise provided by the agreement:

A. the arbitrators shall appoint a time and place for the hearing and cause notification to the parties to be served personally or by registered mail or certified mail, return receipt requested, not less than five days before the hearing. Appearance at the hearing waives such notice. The arbitrators may adjourn the hearing from time to time as necessary and on request of a party and for good cause or upon their own motion may postpone the hearing to a time not later than the date fixed by the agreement for making the award unless the parties consent to a later date. The arbitrators may hear and determine the controversy upon the evidence produced notwithstanding the failure of a party duly notified to appear. The court on application may direct the arbitrators to proceed promptly with the hearing and determination of the controversy;

B. the parties are entitled to be heard, to present evidence material to the controversy and to cross-examine witnesses appearing at the hearing;

C. the hearing shall be conducted by all the arbitrators, but a majority may determine any question and render a final award. If during the course of the hearing, an arbitrator for any reason ceases to act, the remaining arbitrator or arbitrators appointed to act as neutrals may continue with the hearing and determination of the controversy.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-13, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 5.

Law reviews. - For note, "Uninsured Motorist Arbitration," see 3 N.M.L. Rev. 220 (1973).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 108 to 123.

Necessity and sufficiency of notice of and hearing in proceedings before appraisers and arbitrators appointed to determine amount of insurance loss, 25 A.L.R.3d 680.

6 C.J.S. Arbitration §§ 79 to 88.

§ 44-7-6. Representation by attorney.

A party has the right to be represented by an attorney at any proceeding or hearing under the Uniform Arbitration Act [44-7-1 to 44-7-22 NMSA 1978]. A waiver thereof prior to the proceeding or hearing is ineffective.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-14, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 6.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - Attorney's submission of dispute to arbitration, or amendment of arbitration agreement, without client's knowledge or consent, 48 A.L.R.4th 127.

6 C.J.S. Arbitration § 89.

§ 44-7-7. Witnesses; subpoenas; depositions.

A. The arbitrators may issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and for the production of books, records, documents and other evidence, and shall have the power to administer oaths. Subpoenas so issued shall be served and, upon application to the court by a party or the arbitrators, enforced in the manner provided by law for the service and enforcement of subpoenas in a civil action.

B. On application of a party and for use as evidence, the arbitrators may permit a deposition to be taken, in the manner and upon the terms designated by the arbitrators, of a witness who cannot be subpoenaed or is unable to attend the hearing.

C. All provisions of law compelling a person under subpoena to testify are applicable.

D. Fees for attendance as a witness shall be the same as for a witness in the district court.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-15, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 7.

Cross-references. - As to fees for attendance of witnesses generally, see 10-8-1 to 10-8-7, 38-6-4 NMSA 1978. As to subpoenas of witnesses and documentary evidence generally, see Rule 1-045 SCRA 1986.

Law reviews. - For note, "Uninsured Motorist Arbitration," see 3 N.M.L. Rev. 220 (1973).

For article, "The Contract to Arbitrate Future Disputes: A Comparison of the New Mexico Act with the New York and Federal Acts," see 9 N.M.L. Rev. 71 (1978-79).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award § 121. Discovery in aid of arbitration proceedings, 98 A.L.R.2d 1247. 6 C.J.S. Arbitration § 87.

§ 44-7-8. Award.

A. The award shall be in writing and signed by the arbitrators joining in the award. The arbitrators shall deliver a copy to each party personally or by registered mail or certified mail, return receipt requested, or as provided in the agreement.

B. An award shall be made within the time fixed therefor by the agreement or if not so fixed, within such time as the court orders on application of a party. The parties may extend the time in writing either before or after the expiration thereof. A party waives the objection that an award was not made within the time required unless he notifies the arbitrators of his objection prior to the delivery of the award to him.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-16, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 8.

Delivered copy need not be signed. - Subsection A requires that a copy be delivered, not that a signed and acknowledged document, which would be a duplicate original, be delivered. There is no requirement that the copy be signed. Chaco Energy Co. v. Thercol Energy Co., 97 N.M. 127, 637 P.2d 558 (1981).

Delivery method important if delivery does not occur within limits. - Where delivery is not accomplished by the method required by this section, the important consideration is whether delivery actually occurs within the required time. The method becomes important if the delivery is not accomplished within the required time, although the statutory method of posting is complied with. Chaco Energy Co. v. Thercol Energy Co., 97 N.M. 127, 637 P.2d 558 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 124, 125, 128.

Death of party to arbitration agreement before award as revocation or termination of submission, 63 A.L.R.2d 754.

Failure of arbitrators to make award within specified time limit, 56 A.L.R.3d 815.

Referee's failure to file report within time specified by statute, court order, or stipulation as terminating reference, 71 A.L.R.4th 889.

6 C.J.S. Arbitration §§ 96 to 102.

§ 44-7-9. Change of award by arbitrators.

On application of a party or if an application to the court is pending under Sections 11 [44-7-11 NMSA 1978], 12 [44-7-12 NMSA 1978] or 13 [44-7-13 NMSA 1978], on submission to the arbitrators by the court under such conditions as the court may order, the arbitrators may modify or correct the award upon the grounds stated in Paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection A of Section 13 [44-7-13 NMSA 1978] or for the purpose of clarifying the award. The application shall be made within twenty days after delivery of the award to the applicant. Written notice thereof shall be given forthwith to the opposing party, stating he must serve his objections thereto, if any, within ten days from the notice. The award so modified or corrected is subject to the provisions of Sections 11 [44-7-11 NMSA 1978], 12 [44-7-12 NMSA 1978] and 13 [44-7-13 NMSA 1978].

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-17, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 9.

Period for arbitrators' action set by agreement. - Where an arbitration agreement establishes a period beyond which the arbitrators cannot act, it does not prevent them from deciding and disposing of the matter before the expiration of the prescribed period. It does not extend their authority once they make a decision intended to be final and binding on the parties. *Chaco Energy Co. v. Thercol Energy Co.*, 97 N.M. 127, 637 P.2d 558 (1981).

Effect of amended award. - An amended award for purposes other than those specified in 44-7-13A NMSA 1978 is void and of no effect. *Chaco Energy Co. v. Thercol Energy Co.*, 97 N.M. 127, 637 P.2d 558 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - Award or decision by arbitrators as precluding return of case to, or its reconsideration by them, 104 A.L.R. 710.

Liability of organization sponsoring or administering arbitration to parties involved in proceeding, 41 A.L.R.4th 1013.

§ 44-7-10. Fees and expenses of arbitration.

Unless otherwise provided in the agreement to arbitrate, the arbitrators' expenses and

fees, together with other expenses, not including counsel fees, incurred in the conduct of the arbitration, shall be paid as provided in the award.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-18, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 10.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award § 139.
6 C.J.S. Arbitration §§ 75, 179, 180.

§ 44-7-11. Confirmation of an award.

Upon application of a party, the court shall confirm an award, unless within the time limits hereinafter imposed grounds are urged for vacating or modifying or correcting the award, in which case the court shall proceed as provided in Sections 12 [44-7-12 NMSA 1978] and 13 [44-7-13 NMSA 1978].

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-19, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 11.

Law reviews. - For note, "Uninsured Motorist Arbitration," see 3 N.M.L. Rev. 220 (1973).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 184, 185.
6 C.J.S. Arbitration § 157.

§ 44-7-12. Vacating an award.

A. Upon application of a party, the court shall vacate an award where:

- (1) the award was procured by corruption, fraud or other undue means;
- (2) there was evident partiality by an arbitrator appointed as a neutral or corruption in any of the arbitrators or misconduct prejudicing the rights of any party;
- (3) the arbitrators exceeded their powers;
- (4) the arbitrators refused to postpone the hearing upon sufficient cause being shown therefor or refused to hear evidence material to the controversy or otherwise so conducted the hearing, contrary to the provisions of Section 5 [44-7-5 NMSA 1978], as to prejudice substantially the rights of a party; or
- (5) there was no arbitration agreement and the issue was not adversely determined in proceedings under Section 2 [44-7-2 NMSA 1978] and the party did not participate in the arbitration hearing without raising the objection. The fact that the relief was such that it could not or would not be granted by a court of law or equity is not ground for vacating or refusing to confirm the award.

B. An application under this section shall be made within ninety days after delivery of a copy of the award to the applicant except that, if predicated upon corruption, fraud or other undue means, it shall be made within ninety days after such grounds are known or should have been known.

C. In vacating the award on grounds other than stated in Paragraph (5) of Subsection A the court may order a rehearing before new arbitrators chosen as provided in the agreement, or in the absence thereof, by the court in accordance with Section 3 [44-7-3 NMSA 1978], or if the award is vacated on grounds set forth in Paragraphs (3) and (4) of Subsection A the court may order a rehearing before the arbitrators who made the award or their successors appointed in accordance with Section 3 [44-7-3 NMSA 1978]. The time within which the agreement requires the award to be made is applicable to the rehearing and commences from the date of the order.

D. If the application to vacate is denied and no motion to modify or correct the award is pending, the court shall confirm the award.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-20, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 12.

Potential neutral arbitrators need not sever all their ties with the business world. *Ormsbee Dev. Co. v. Grace*, 668 F.2d 1140 (10th Cir.), cert. denied, 459 U.S. 838, 103 S. Ct. 84, 74 L. Ed. 2d 79 (1982).

Record not required for appeal. - The fact that a record is permitted in the arbitration proceeding cannot be construed to mean that a record is a prerequisite to the appeal provisions afforded by the Uniform Arbitration Act. *Malibu Pools of N.M., Inc. v. Harvard*, 97 N.M. 106, 637 P.2d 537 (1981).

Grounds for vacation where record unavailable. - Where a record of the arbitration proceeding is unavailable, an aggrieved party is not thereby precluded from asserting and proving any grounds set forth in this section for vacation of an arbitration award. *Malibu Pools of N.M., Inc. v. Harvard*, 97 N.M. 106, 637 P.2d 537 (1981).

Record on appeal to contain evidence of claims regarding vacation of award. - Where a party claims that the trial court should vacate the award because the arbitrator allegedly evidenced partiality and exceeded his powers, and the trial court judge reviews the record of the arbitration proceedings, but his findings do not indicate whether the record contains substantial evidence supporting or negating such claims, nor is the record of the arbitration proceedings made a part of the record for appeal, the case will be remanded to the district court to determine whether the arbitration record supports confirmation, or, in the alternative, vacation or modification of the award. *Daniels Ins. Agency, Inc. v. Jordan*, 99 N.M. 297, 657 P.2d 624 (1982).

Scope of review. - It is not the function of the court to hear the case de novo and consider the evidence presented to the arbitrators, but rather to conduct an evidentiary

hearing and enter findings of fact and conclusions of law upon each issue raised in the application to vacate or modify the award. *Melton v. Lyon*, 108 N.M. 420, 773 P.2d 732 (1989).

Once an arbitration award is entered, the finality of arbitration weighs heavily in its favor and cannot be upset except under exceptional circumstances. *Melton v. Lyon*, 108 N.M. 420, 773 P.2d 732 (1989).

Alleged misconduct of panel as grounds. - A trial court errs in refusing to hear evidence of an arbitration panel's alleged misconduct for its failure to hear evidence material to the controversy. *Malibu Pools of N.M., Inc. v. Harvard*, 97 N.M. 106, 637 P.2d 537 (1981).

Burden of establishing fraud. - The party asserting fraud must establish it by clear and convincing evidence and must show that due diligence could not have resulted in discovery of the fraud prior to arbitration. *Foster v. Turley*, 808 F.2d 38 (10th Cir. 1986).

Arbitrators authorized to suggest appropriate amount of punitive damages. - The arbitration panel did not exceed its powers where, in a dispute between an insured and the automobile insurance company, it suggested the appropriate amount of punitive damages to be assessed, if the proper court determined that punitive damages should be awarded. *Stewart v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 104 N.M. 744, 726 P.2d 1374 (1986).

Law reviews. - For note, "Uninsured Motorist Arbitration," see 3 N.M. L. Rev. 220 (1973).

For article, "The Contract to Arbitrate Future Disputes: A Comparison of the New Mexico Act with the New York and Federal Acts," see 9 N.M.L. Rev. 71 (1978-79).

For article, "Survey of New Mexico Law, 1979-80: Civil Procedure," see 11 N.M.L. Rev. 53 (1981).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 167, 168, 171, 173 to 181, 185, 189.

Improper attempt by influencing or by attempting to influence decision as ground for revocation, or for avoidance of award thereunder, 8 A.L.R. 1082.

Perjury as ground of attack on judgment entered upon award in arbitration, 99 A.L.R. 1202.

Right of arbitrator to consider or to base his decision upon matters other than those involved in the legal principles applicable to the questions at issue between the parties, 112 A.L.R. 873.

Right of arbitrators to act on their own knowledge of facts, or factors relevant to questions submitted to them, in absence of evidence in that regard, 154 A.L.R. 1210.

Time and jurisdiction for review, reopening, modification or reinstatement of award or agreement, 165 A.L.R. 9.

Arbitrator's viewing or visiting premises or property alone as misconduct justifying vacation of award, 27 A.L.R.2d 1160.

Arbitrator's consultation with outsider or outsiders as misconduct justifying vacation of award, 47 A.L.R.2d 1362.

Disqualification of arbitrator by court or stay of arbitration proceedings prior to award, on ground of interest, bias, prejudice, collusion or fraud of arbitrators, 65 A.L.R.2d 755.

Time for impeaching arbitration award, 85 A.L.R.2d 779.

Construction and effect of contractual or statutory provisions fixing time within which arbitration award must be made, 56 A.L.R.3d 815.

What constitutes corruption, fraud, or undue means in obtaining arbitration award justifying avoidance of award under state law, 22 A.L.R.4th 366.

6 C.J.S. Arbitration §§ 149 to 155, 157, 160, 167.

§ 44-7-13. Modification or correction of award.

A. Upon application made within ninety days after delivery of a copy of the award to the applicant, the court shall modify or correct the award where:

(1) there was an evident miscalculation of figures or an evident mistake in the description of any person, thing or property referred to in the award;

(2) the arbitrators have awarded upon a matter not submitted to them and the award may be corrected without affecting the merits of the decision upon the issues submitted; or

(3) the award is imperfect in a matter of form, not affecting the merits of the controversy.

B. If the application is granted, the court shall modify and correct the award so as to effect its intent and shall confirm the award as so modified and corrected. Otherwise, the court shall confirm the award as made.

C. An application to modify or correct an award may be joined in the alternative with an application to vacate the award.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-21, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 13.

Award amended for other purposes void. - An amended award for purposes other than those specified in subsection A is void and of no effect. *Chaco Energy Co. v. Thercol Energy Co.*, 97 N.M. 127, 637 P.2d 558 (1981).

Scope of review. - It is not the function of the court to hear the case de novo and consider the evidence presented to the arbitrators, but rather to conduct an evidentiary hearing and enter findings of fact and conclusions of law upon each issue raised in the application to vacate or modify the award. *Melton v. Lyon*, 108 N.M. 420, 773 P.2d 732 (1989).

Once an arbitration award is entered, the finality of arbitration weighs heavily in its favor and cannot be upset except under exceptional circumstances. *Melton v. Lyon*, 108 N.M. 420, 773 P.2d 732 (1989).

Law reviews. - For note, "Uninsured Motorist Arbitration," see 3 N.M. L. Rev. 220 (1973).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award § 188. Time and jurisdiction for review, reopening, modification or reinstatement of award or agreement, 165 A.L.R. 9.
6 C.J.S. Arbitration § 168.

§ 44-7-14. Judgment or decree on award.

Upon the granting of an order confirming, modifying or correcting an award, judgment or decree shall be entered in conformity therewith and be enforced as any other judgment or decree. Costs of the application and of the proceedings subsequent thereto, and disbursements may be awarded by the court.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-22, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 14.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - Enforcement of award upon submission of subject-matter of pending action, to arbitration, by judgment in same action, 42 A.L.R. 736.

Extraterritorial enforcement of arbitral award, 73 A.L.R. 1460.

§ 44-7-15. Judgment roll; docketing.

A. On entry of judgment or decree, the clerk shall prepare the judgment roll consisting, to the extent filed, of the following:

- (1) the agreement and each written extension of the time within which to make the award;
- (2) the award;
- (3) a copy of the order confirming, modifying or correcting the award; and
- (4) a copy of the judgment or decree.

B. The judgment or decree may be docketed as if rendered in an action.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-23, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 15.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 75, 185, 186.
6 C.J.S. Arbitration §§ 42, 157.

§ 44-7-16. Application to court.

Except as otherwise provided, an application to the court under the Uniform Arbitration Act [44-7-1 to 44-7-22 NMSA 1978] shall be by motion and shall be heard in the manner and upon the notice provided by law or rule of court for the making and hearing of motions. Unless the parties have agreed otherwise, notice of an initial application for an order shall be served in the manner provided by law for the service of a summons in an action.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-24, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 16.

Cross-references. - As to motions generally, see Rules 1-007 to 1-016 SCRA 1986. As to service of summons, see Rule 1-004 SCRA 1986.

§ 44-7-17. Court; jurisdiction.

The term "court" means any court of competent jurisdiction of this state. The making of an agreement described in Section 1 [44-7-1 NMSA 1978] providing for arbitration in this state confers jurisdiction on the court to enforce the agreement under the Uniform Arbitration Act [44-7-1 to 44-7-22 NMSA 1978] and to enter judgment on an award thereunder.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-25, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 17.

No power to consolidate arbitration. - While this section gives New Mexico courts jurisdiction to enforce contracts to arbitrate, no express provision in the act confers on courts the power to consolidate arbitration. *Pueblo of Laguna v. Cillessen & Son*, 101 N.M. 341, 682 P.2d 197 (1984).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 36, 74.
6 C.J.S. Arbitration § 40.

§ 44-7-18. Venue.

An initial application shall be made to the court of the county in which the agreement provides the arbitration hearing shall be held or if the hearing has been held, in the county in which it was held. Otherwise the application shall be made in the county where the adverse party resides or has a place of business or, if he has no residence or

place of business in this state, to the court of any county. All subsequent applications shall be made to the court hearing the initial application unless the court otherwise directs.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-26, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 18.

§ 44-7-19. Appeals.

A. An appeal may be taken from:

(1) an order denying an application to compel arbitration made under Section 2 [44-7-2 NMSA 1978];

(2) an order granting an application to stay arbitration made under Subsection B of Section 2 [44-7-2 NMSA 1978];

(3) an order confirming or denying confirmation of an award;

(4) an order modifying or correcting an award;

(5) an order vacating an award without directing a rehearing; or

(6) a judgment or decree entered pursuant to the provisions of the Uniform Arbitration Act [44-7-1 to 44-7-22 NMSA 1978].

B. The appeal shall be taken in the manner and to the same extent as from orders or judgments in a civil action.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-27, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 19.

Cross-references. - As to appeals generally, see Rules 12-201 to 12-216 SCRA 1986.

Law reviews. - For note, "Uninsured Motorist Arbitration," see 3 N.M. L. Rev. 220 (1973).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - 5 Am. Jur. 2d Arbitration and Award §§ 82, 145.

Appealability of order or decree compelling or refusing to compel arbitration, 94 A.L.R.2d 1071.

Appealability of judgment confirming or setting aside arbitration award, 7 A.L.R.3d 608.

Appealability of state court's order of decree compelling or refusing to compel arbitration, 6 A.L.R.4th 652.

6 C.J.S. Arbitration §§ 6, 32, 44, 46, 161.

§ 44-7-20. Act not retroactive.

The Uniform Arbitration Act [44-7-1 to 44-7-22 NMSA 1978] applies only to agreements made subsequent to the effective date of the Uniform Arbitration Act.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-28, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 20.

Effective dates. - Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 25, makes the act effective on July 1, 1971.

Law reviews. - For article, "The Contract to Arbitrate Future Disputes: A Comparison of the New Mexico Act with the New York and Federal Acts," see 9 N.M.L. Rev. 71 (1978-79).

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - Statute of limitations as bar to arbitration under agreement, 94 A.L.R.3d 522.

Conflict of laws as to validity and effect of arbitration provision in contract for purchase or sale of goods, products, or services, 95 A.L.R.3d 1145.

§ 44-7-21. Uniformity of interpretation.

The Uniform Arbitration Act [44-7-1 to 44-7-22 NMSA 1978] shall be so construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of those states which enact it.

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-29, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 21.

§ 44-7-22. Short title.

This act [44-7-1 to 44-7-22 NMSA 1978] may be cited as the "Uniform Arbitration Act."

History: 1953 Comp., § 22-3-31, enacted by Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 23.

Effective dates. - Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 25, makes the act effective on July 1, 1971.

Severability clauses. - Laws 1971, ch. 168, § 22, provides for the severability of the act if any part or application thereof is held invalid.

Am. Jur. 2d, A.L.R. and C.J.S. references. - Conflict of laws as to validity and effect of arbitration provision in contract for purchase or sale of goods, products or services, 95 A.L.R.3d 1145.