

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Court of Appeals of New Mexico
Filed 9/24/2026 7:32 AM

JAYLENE QUILES,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

No. A-1-CA-43404

**DEPARTMENT OF
WORKFORCE SOLUTIONS,
CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEW
MEXICO, and LOUIE
TRUJILLO,**

Defendants-Appellees.

**APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF SAN MIGUEL COUNTY
Emilio Chavez, District Court Judge**

Jaylene Quiles
Las Vegas, NM

Pro Se Appellant

New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions
Andrea Christman
Richard L. Branch
Albuquerque, NM

for Appellee N.M. Department of Workforce Solutions

Virtue & Najjar, PC
Jared Daniel Albert Najjar
Santa Fe, NM

for Appellees City of Las Vegas, NM and Louie Trujillo



Mark Reynolds

MEMORANDUM OPINION

HENDERSON, Judge.

{1} Plaintiff appeals following the district court's order granting Defendants' motions to dismiss Plaintiff's second amended complaint. [2 RP 267-72] We entered a calendar notice, proposing to affirm. Plaintiff filed a memorandum in opposition, which we have duly considered. Unpersuaded, we affirm.


{2} In our calendar notice, we noted that Plaintiff's docketing statement contained only conclusory allegations and did not provide this Court with a coherent narrative of the relevant facts to consider this appeal, did not provide clear issues for our consideration that were preserved in the district court, and did not indicate how the district court erred in entering an order dismissing Plaintiff's second amended complaint. [CN 2-3] In Plaintiff's memorandum in opposition, Plaintiff continues to make the same or similar conclusory allegations as what was contained in the docketing statement, and does not provide a coherent narrative of facts relevant to this appeal. We note that Plaintiff appears to be taking issue with an injunction that was issued on "08-22-2022," but the record in this case did not begin until February 8, 2024, and we did not locate anything in the record evidencing that the district court had issued an injunction against Plaintiff. [RP 1] "Matters not of record present no issue for review." *State v. Hunter*, 2001-NMCA-078, ¶ 18, 131 N.M. 76, 33 P.3d 296.

1 {3} Additionally, Plaintiff attached to the memorandum in opposition sixty-one
2 pages of images. [MIO PDF 6-67] Plaintiff does not explain the relevancy of these
3 attachments, and “[i]t is improper for a party to attach to its briefs documents that
4 were not part of the record below.” See *King v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 2004-NMCA-031,
5 ¶ 20, 135 N.M. 206, 86 P.3d 631; see also *Durham v. Guest*, 2009-NMSC-007, ¶ 9,
6 145 N.M. 694, 204 P.3d 19 (noting that the “[r]eference to exhibits not in the record
7 proper and not presented to the district court for consideration is improper and a
8 violation of the Rules of Appellate Procedure”).

9 {4} Lastly, as we noted in our calendar notice, the district court dismissed this
10 case below because the allegations contained in Plaintiff’s complaint “did not state
11 a claim upon which relief can be granted and were insufficient under Rule 1-
12 012(B)(6) NMRA.” [CN 3] Plaintiff’s docketing statement provided no basis for this
13 Court to reverse the district court’s decision. See *Farmers, Inc. v. Dal Mach. &*
14 *Fabricating, Inc.*, 1990-NMSC-100, ¶ 8, 111 N.M. 6, 800 P.2d 1063 (“The
15 presumption upon review favors the correctness of the [district] court’s actions. [The
16 appellant must affirmatively demonstrate its assertion of error.”). Plaintiff’s
17 memorandum in opposition again provides no basis for this Court to conclude that
18 error occurred below. See *State v. Laney*, 2003-NMCA-144, ¶¶ 32-33, 134 N.M.
19 648, 81 P.3d 591 (refusing to address arguments raised on appeal where the appellant
20 points to no specific error); *Farmers, Inc.*, 1990-NMSC-100, ¶ 8.


1 {5} Accordingly, and for the reasons stated in our calendar notice, we affirm.

2 {6} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**




3
4 **SHAMMARA H. HENDERSON, Judge**

5 **WE CONCUR:**



6
7 **MEGAN P. DUFFY, Judge**



8
9 **JANE B. YOHALEM, Judge**