

**ZAMORA V. BJ SERVICES**

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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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

**LOUIS MICHAEL ZAMORA,**  
Worker-Appellant,  
v.  
**BJ SERVICES/BAKER HUGHES,  
CRAWFORD & CO. AND PARTIES  
JOINDER,**  
Employer-Appellees.

NO. 32,509

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEW MEXICO

July 1, 2013

APPEAL FROM THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION, Shanon S.  
Riley, Workers' Compensation Judge

**COUNSEL**

Louis Michael Zamora, Littleton, CO, Pro se Appellant

Hale and Dixon PC, Timothy S. Hale, Paulette J. Dixon, Albuquerque, NM, for  
Appellees

**JUDGES**

JAMES J. WECHSLER, Judge. WE CONCUR: JONATHAN B. SUTIN, Judge, LINDA  
M. VANZI, Judge

**AUTHOR:** JAMES J. WECHSLER

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**WECHSLER, Judge.**

**{1}** Worker appeals the decision of the Workers Compensation Administration (WCA) denying his motion for reconsideration and thereby refusing to amend his compensation order. We proposed to affirm in a calendar notice. Rather than filing a memorandum in opposition as authorized by our Rules of Appellate Procedure, Worker has filed a document that appears to be a motion and proposed order, which does not address any of the discussion set out in our calendar notice. Due to Worker's failure to provide any argument opposing the proposed summary affirmance, we affirm for the reasons stated in the calendar notice.

**{2}** We note in addition that the document filed by Worker, entitled "NOTICE OF [DEFICIENCY] OF RECORD," bears a Court of Appeals letterhead and concludes with directory language ("IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED") as well as a signature line purporting to be for the signature of Chief Judge Roderick Kennedy. The document ostensibly orders Employer, Employer's counsel, the WCA Judge, WCA Directors, and other individuals to take certain actions. We construe the document as a proposed order submitted for this Court's consideration. However, our Rules of Appellate Procedure do not provide for such a document. Should Worker have occasion to submit any pleadings to this Court in the future, those filings shall be limited to pleadings authorized by our Appellate Rules.

**{3}** For the reasons discussed in this opinion and in our calendar notice, we affirm the decision of the Workers' Compensation Judge in this case and enter the above order.

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

**JAMES J. WECHSLER, Judge**

**WE CONCUR:**

**JONATHAN B. SUTIN, Judge**

**LINDA M. VANZI, Judge**