

Corrections to this opinion/decision not affecting the outcome, at the Court's discretion, can occur up to the time of publication with NM Compilation Commission. The Court will ensure that the electronic version of this opinion/decision is updated accordingly in Odyssey.

1 **IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO**

2 **JESSIE CARTER,**

3 Plaintiff-Appellant,

Court of Appeals of New Mexico

Filed 12/23/2025 8:51 AM


Mark Reynolds

4 v.

No. A-1-CA-42836

5 **CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE and**
6 **ALBUQUERQUE POLICE**
7 **DEPARTMENT,**

8 Defendants-Appellees.

9 **APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BERNALILO COUNTY**
10 **Lisa C. Ortega, District Court Judge**

11 Western Agriculture, Resource and
12 Business Advocates, LLP

13 A. Blair Dunn

14 Jared R. Vander Dussen

15 Albuquerque, NM

16 Archuleta Romaine Law Firm, P.C.

17 Les Romaine

18 Jerry Archuleta

19 Santa Fe, NM

20 for Appellant

21 Catherine M. Gonzalez, Special Counsel

22 Albuquerque, NM

23 Jones, Skelton & Hochuli P.L.C.

24 Allison M. Beaulieu

25 Albuquerque, NM

26 for Appellees

MEMORANDUM OPINION

2 ATTREP, Judge.

3 {1} Plaintiff appeals from the district court's order granting Defendants' motion
4 for summary judgment on Plaintiff's Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA) claim.
5 This Court issued a calendar notice proposing to affirm. Plaintiff has filed a
6 memorandum in opposition and Defendants have filed a memorandum in support,
7 both of which we have duly considered. We affirm.

8 {2} Plaintiff’s memorandum in opposition reasserts that the district court erred by
9 granting summary judgment because the district court misapplied our test for
10 determining if someone is a “public employer” for purposes of the WPA, as
11 explained in *Janet v. Marshall*, 2013-NMCA-037, 296 P.3d 1253. [MIO 2-5] *See id.*
12 ¶¶ 12, 14 (explaining that the test is “whether supreme power or freedom from
13 external control has been vested in the holder of the position” and when someone is
14 “not autonomous and independent in their duties and decision making and [is] not
15 free from the ultimate decision-making authority of their superiors,” they are not a
16 public employer for purposes of the WPA (alteration, internal quotation marks, and
17 citation omitted)).

18 {3} In our calendar notice, we proposed to conclude that Plaintiff failed to
19 establish that summary judgment was improper under the test for determining
20 whether someone is an officer of the state such that their conduct falls under the

1 WPA. [CN 3-4] It appeared from the record proper that “Defendants provided an
2 organization chart of the police department showing that the detectives and the
3 sergeant act[ed] under the authority and direction of others in the chain of command
4 in the scope of their duty.” [CN 4] Further, since the detectives and sergeant were
5 “assigned” the investigation, they were “not autonomous and independent in their
6 duties and decision[-]making and were not free from the ultimate decision-making
7 authority of their superiors such that they are not public employers for purposes of
8 the WPA.” [CN 4] Our review of the record proper additionally showed that the
9 affidavit Plaintiff contended created a genuine issue of material fact “only describes
10 the conduct at issue” and not whether the detectives and sergeant were independent
11 in their decision-making. [CN 4]

12 {4} While Plaintiff maintains that the district court erred and that summary
13 judgment was improper, Plaintiff’s memorandum in opposition does not argue that
14 a genuine issue of material fact existed such that summary judgment was improper.
15 Rather, Plaintiff argues that the district court’s order and our proposed affirmance
16 “would represent a drastic narrowing of [the WPA]’s protections and would fly in
17 the face of the [WPA]’s purpose.” [MIO 4] Plaintiff cites an unpublished opinion of
18 this Court, *Parsons v. Vill. of Corrales*, A-1-CA-40997, mem. op. (N.M. Ct. App.
19 Sept. 15, 2025) (nonprecedential), and unrelated district court proceedings in
20 support. [MIO 2, 5]

1 {5} We remain unpersuaded. As Plaintiff admits, the WPA requires that the
2 “unlawful or improper act” complained of be “on the part of a *public employer*.”
3 [MIO 3] NMSA 1978, § 10-16C-2(E) (2010) (emphasis added). While Plaintiff
4 argues as a matter of policy that this is too restrictive [MIO 2-5], the undisputed facts
5 presented at the district court establish that the complained-of conduct was not done
6 by a public employer. [CN 4]

7 {6} Additionally, we find both the unpublished opinion and district court
8 proceedings unpersuasive. *Parsons* is not binding precedent on this Court for our
9 analysis in the instant case. *See Eastland Fin. Servs. v. Mendoza*, 2002-NMCA-035,
10 ¶ 16, 132 N.M. 24, 43 P.3d 375 (“An unpublished opinion is written solely for the
11 benefit of the parties to the action and has no controlling precedential value.”).
12 Further, *Parsons* did not involve a determination of whether someone was a “public
13 employer” under the WPA. Instead, this Court analyzed whether the employee
14 reported unlawful conduct in good faith and whether the report was for the public
15 benefit as required by the WPA. *See Parsons*, A-1-CA-40997, mem. op. ¶¶ 5-15.
16 Further, a district court order in an unrelated case is not precedential and we decline
17 to consider it. *See Murphy v. Pediatrix Cardiology of N.M., P.C.*, ___-NMCA-___,
18 ¶ 19 n.4, ___ P.3d ___ (A-1-CA-41672, Mar. 10, 2025) (providing that
19 nonprecedential orders from district courts “lack precedential authority so we

1 decline to address them”), *cert. granted, Murphy v. N.M. Superintendent of Ins.*,
2 2025-NMCERT-008, S-1-SC-40815.

3 {7} In sum, Plaintiff has not now asserted any facts, law, or argument in his
4 memorandum in opposition that persuades this Court that our notice of proposed
5 disposition was incorrect. *See State v. Mondragon*, 1988-NMCA-027, ¶ 10, 107
6 N.M. 421, 759 P.2d 1003 (stating that “[a] party responding to a summary calendar
7 notice must come forward and specifically point out errors of law and fact,” and the
8 repetition of earlier arguments does not fulfill this requirement), *superseded by*
9 *statute on other grounds as stated in State v. Harris*, 2013-NMCA-031, ¶ 3, 297 P.3d
10 374; *see also Hennessy v. Duryea*, 1998-NMCA-036, ¶ 24, 124 N.M. 754, 955 P.2d
11 683 (“Our courts have repeatedly held that, in summary calendar cases, the burden
12 is on the party opposing the proposed disposition to clearly point out errors in fact
13 or law.”). Accordingly, for the reasons stated in our notice of proposed disposition
14 and herein, we affirm.

15 {8} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16
17 
JENNIFER L. ATTREP, Judge

1 WE CONCUR:

2 

3 **J. MILES HANISEE, Judge**

4 

5 **GERALD E. BACA, Judge**