This memorandum opinion was not selected for publication in the New Mexico Appellate Reports. Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions. Please also note that this electronic memorandum opinion may contain computer-generated errors or other deviations from the official paper version filed by the Court of Appeals and does not include the filing date.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

2 **RONNIE THOMAS, et al.,**

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

4 v.

1

3

6

NO. 35,020

5 **PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL, et al.,**

Defendants-Appellees.

7 APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BERNALILLO COUNTY 8 Clay Campbell, District Judge

9 Ronnie Thomas 10 Estancia, NM

11 Pro Se Appellant

12 Riley, Shane & Keller, P.A.

13 Richard J. Shane

- 14 MacDonnell Gordon
- 15 Albuquerque, NM

16 for Appellee Presbyterian Healthcare Services

17 MEMORANDUM OPINION
18 KENNEDY, Judge.

1 (1) Appellants, Ronnie Thomas, et al., filed an appeal from the district court's order 2 denying their second Rule 1-060(B) NMRA motion seeking reinstatement of their 3 civil complaint. We filed a notice of proposed summary disposition proposing to 4 affirm the district court on January 14, 2016. On February 3, 2016, Appellee filed a 5 memorandum in support of the proposed summary disposition. Appellant has not filed 6 a response to our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. 8 (2) IT IS SO ORDERED. 90 III 12 MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge 14 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge 15 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge		
 civil complaint. We filed a notice of proposed summary disposition proposing to affirm the district court on January 14, 2016. On February 3, 2016, Appellee filed a memorandum in support of the proposed summary disposition. Appellant has not filed a response to our notice of proposed summary disposition. Therefore, for the reasons set out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. (2) IT IS SO ORDERED. WE CONCUR: MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge 	1	{1} Appellants, Ronnie Thomas, et al., filed an appeal from the district court's order
 affirm the district court on January 14, 2016. On February 3, 2016, Appellee filed a memorandum in support of the proposed summary disposition. Appellant has not filed a response to our notice of proposed summary disposition. Therefore, for the reasons set out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. (2) IT IS SO ORDERED. RODERICK T. KENNEDY, Judge WE CONCUR: MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge 	2	denying their second Rule 1-060(B) NMRA motion seeking reinstatement of their
 memorandum in support of the proposed summary disposition. Appellant has not filed a response to our notice of proposed summary disposition. Therefore, for the reasons set out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. (2) IT IS SO ORDERED. WE CONCUR: WE CONCUR: MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge 	3	civil complaint. We filed a notice of proposed summary disposition proposing to
11 11 11 11 6 a response to our notice of proposed summary disposition. Therefore, for the reasons set out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. 8 [2] IT IS SO ORDERED. 9 10 RODERICK T. KENNEDY, Judge 11 WE CONCUR: Image: Concurrent in the district court. 12 MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge 14 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge	4	affirm the district court on January 14, 2016. On February 3, 2016, Appellee filed a
 rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition. rest out in our notice of proposed summary disposition. rest out in our notice out in out in out not in out n	5	memorandum in support of the proposed summary disposition. Appellant has not filed
8 [2] IT IS SO ORDERED. 9 10 11 WE CONCUR: 12 Image: The second sec	6	a response to our notice of proposed summary disposition. Therefore, for the reasons
9 IN RODERICK T. KENNEDY, Judge 11 WE CONCUR: INCHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge 12 MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge INCHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge 14 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge INCHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge	7	set out in our notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm the district court.
10 RODERICK T. KENNEDY, Judge 12 MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge 14 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge	8	{2} IT IS SO ORDERED.
10 RODERICK T. KENNEDY, Judge 12 MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge 14 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge	9	
11 WE CONCUR: 12		RODERICK T. KENNEDY, Judge
13 MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge 14		
13 MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge 14		
13 MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge 14		
14 15 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge		
15 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge	13	MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge
15 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge		
15 STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge	14	
		STEPHEN G. FRENCH, Judge
2		, 0
2		
2		
2		
2		
2		
2		
2		
2		
2		
		2