

**CORLISS V. BOND**

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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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.

**GLADYS CORLISS,**  
Plaintiff-Appellant,  
**v.**  
**LARRY BOND,**  
Defendant-Appellee.

No. 32,368

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEW MEXICO

March 14, 2013

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF QUAY COUNTY, Albert Mitchell, District  
Judge

**COUNSEL**

Gladys L. Corliss, Tucumcari, NM, Pro Se Appellant

Larry Bond, Tucumcari, NM, Pro Se Appellee

**JUDGES**

CYNTHIA A. FRY, Judge. WE CONCUR: MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge,  
JONATHAN B. SUTIN, Judge

**AUTHOR:** CYNTHIA A. FRY

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**FRY, Judge.**

Plaintiff-Appellant Gladys Corliss (Plaintiff) appeals from the district court's resolution of the underlying civil proceedings. We issued a notice of proposed summary disposition proposing to affirm in most respects, but to reverse as to the scope of the order

prohibiting Plaintiff from filing unsupervised pleadings. Plaintiff has filed a memorandum in opposition. After due consideration, we remain unpersuaded.

We previously set forth our analysis relative to the merits of the various issues suggested by the docketing statement. In the lengthy memorandum in opposition, we understand Plaintiff to continue to raise the same assertions of error. However, we discern nothing new in the memorandum in opposition in the way of persuasive authority or argument. We therefore adhere to our prior assessment with respect to all issues.

The only new matter raised in the memorandum in opposition involves Plaintiff's inclusion of one or more Court of Appeals judges within the scope of her attacks on the integrity of all other judges who have had any involvement with this case. To the extent that these unsupported assertions are suggested as any basis for relief, we reject Plaintiff's argument.

Accordingly, for the reasons previously stated, we reverse with respect to the scope of the order prohibiting Plaintiff from future unsupervised filings in the district courts of this State, and remand for appropriate modification. *See State v. Ngo*, 2001- NMCA-041, ¶ 25, 130 N.M. 515, 27 P.3d 1002. In all other respects, the district court is affirmed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**CYNTHIA A. FRY, Judge**

**WE CONCUR:**

**MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge**

**JONATHAN B. SUTIN, Judge**