SRMOF 2009-1 TRUST V. KHALSA

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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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

SRMOF 2009-1 TRUST.

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

GURUNEIL SINGH KHALSA GOODMAN, JAGAT KHALSA, OCCUPANTS, WHOSE TRUE NAMES ARE UNKNOWN, if any, THE UNKNOWN SPOUSE OF GURUNEIL SINGH KHALSA GOODMAN A/K/A GURUNEIL SINGH KHALSA GOODMAN, if any, and THE UNKNOWN SPOUSE OF JAGAT KHALSA, if any,

Defendants-Appellants.

No. 31,786

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEW MEXICO

August 1, 2012

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF SANTA FE COUNTY, Sarah M. Singleton, District Judge

COUNSEL

Castle Stawiarski, LLC, Elizabeth Mason, Michael Neil, Albuquerque, NM, for Appellee

Guruneil Singh Khalsa Goodman, Santa Cruz, NM, Jagar Khalsa, Espanola, NM, Mukhtiar S. Khalsa, Santa Cruz, NM, Pro Se Appellants

JUDGES

MICHAEL E. VIGIL, Judge. WE CONCUR: MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge, JONATHAN B. SUTIN, Judge

AUTHOR: MICHAEL E. VIGIL

MEMORANDUM OPINION

VIGIL, Judge.

Guruneil Singh Khalsa Goodman (Guruneil), Jagat Khalsa (Jagat), and Mukhtiar S. Khalsa (Mukhtiar), have appealed from the denial of their motion to set aside a default judgment in the underlying foreclosure action. We filed a notice of proposed summary disposition on March 29, 2012. As to Jagat, we proposed to affirm the default judgment; as to Guruneil, we proposed to reverse the default judgment; and as to Mukhtiar, we proposed that he was not a proper party to the appeal. On April 20, 2012, Guruneil and Mukhtiar filed a memorandum in support of the proposed summary disposition. No memorandum in opposition has been filed, and the time for doing so has long since passed.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in the notice of proposed summary disposition, we affirm in part, reverse in part, and remand for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

MICHAEL E. VIGIL, Judge

WE CONCUR:

MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge

JONATHAN B. SUTIN, Judge