

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

2 **LAURIE JEANNE NADEAU and**  
3 **MARC EDWARD NADEAU,**

Court of Appeals of New Mexico  
Filed 4/22/2026 9:08 AM



Mark Reynolds

4 Plaintiffs-Appellees,

5 v.

**No. A-1-CA-42642**

6 **KRIS RAMANI,**

7 Defendant-Appellant,

8 and

9 **MARGARET NAVA; MANUEL RUIZ;**  
10 **STURDY HOMES, LTD., CO.;**  
11 **SOL SYSTEM BUILDERS, LLC; and**  
12 **DOES 1 THROUGH 5, inclusive,**

13 Defendants.

14 **APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF COLFAX COUNTY**

15 **Steven A. Romero, District Court Judge**

16 New Mexico Legal Center, P.C.

17 Lee Boothby

18 Taos, NM

19 for Appellees

20 Kris Ramani

21 Albuquerque, NM

22 Pro Se Appellant

1 **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

2 **WRAY, Judge.**

3 {1} Defendant appeals from the district court’s order granting summary judgment  
4 against him and in favor of Plaintiffs. This Court issued a calendar notice proposing  
5 to summarily affirm. Defendant filed a memorandum in opposition, which we have  
6 duly considered. Unpersuaded, we affirm.

7 {2} In his memorandum in opposition, Defendant maintains the district court  
8 denied him and the other Defendants the right of self-representation, erroneously  
9 entered judgment against Defendant Nava, erroneously entered identical damages  
10 against each Defendant without evidentiary support, was biased, and treated the  
11 Defendants unfairly. [MIO 2-4] The arguments contained in Defendant’s  
12 memorandum in opposition do not persuade us that this Court’s proposed summary  
13 disposition was in error. As such, we affirm for the reasons stated in our notice of  
14 proposed disposition. *See Hennessy v. Duryea*, 1998-NMCA-036, ¶ 24, 124 N.M.  
15 754, 955 P.2d 683 (“Our courts have repeatedly held that, in summary calendar  
16 cases, the burden is on the party opposing the proposed disposition to clearly point  
17 out errors in fact or law.”); *State v. Mondragon*, 1988-NMCA-027, ¶ 10, 107 N.M.  
18 421, 759 P.2d 1003 (stating that “[a] party responding to a summary calendar notice  
19 must come forward and specifically point out errors of law and fact,” and the  
20 repetition of earlier arguments does not fulfill this requirement), *superseded by*


1 *statute on other grounds as stated in State v. Harris, 2013-NMCA-031, ¶ 3, 297 P.3d*  
2 374.

3 {3} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4   
5 **KATHERINE A. WRAY, Judge**

6 **WE CONCUR:**

7   
8 **JENNIFER L. ATTKER, Judge**

9   
10 **MEGAN P. DUFFY, Judge**