

This decision of the New Mexico Court of Appeals was not selected for publication in the New Mexico Appellate Reports. Refer to Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished decisions. Electronic decisions may contain computer-generated errors or other deviations from the official version filed by the Court of Appeals.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO**

**No. A-1-CA-39819**

**RUBEL ROMERO,**

Worker-Appellant,

v.

**SILVERADO ENTERPRISES INC. and  
FEDERATED MUTUAL INSURANCE  
COMPANY,**

Employer/Insurer-Appellees.

**APPEAL FROM THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION  
Anthony Couture, Workers' Compensation Judge**

Rubel Romero  
Santa Fe, NM

Pro Se Appellant

Timothy A. Lucas  
Roswell, NM

for Appellees

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**HANISEE, Chief Judge.**

{1} Worker Rubel Romero appeals from the Workers' Compensation Judge's (WCJ) order dismissing his complaint. We issued a notice of proposed disposition, in which we proposed to summarily affirm. Worker filed a memorandum in opposition, which we have duly considered. We remain unpersuaded that Worker has shown error, and we, therefore, affirm the ruling of the WCJ.

{2} Worker's memorandum in opposition has not convinced us that our initial proposed disposition was erroneous. *See State v. Mondragon*, 1988-NMCA-027, ¶ 10,

107 N.M. 421, 759 P.2d 1003 (stating that “[a] party responding to a summary calendar notice must come forward and specifically point out errors of law and fact,” and the repetition of earlier arguments does not fulfill this requirement), *superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in State v. Harris*, 2013-NMCA-031, ¶ 3, 297 P.3d 374; *Hennessy v. Duryea*, 1998-NMCA-036, ¶ 24, 124 N.M. 754, 955 P.2d 683 (“Our courts have repeatedly held that, in summary calendar cases, the burden is on the party opposing the proposed disposition to clearly point out errors in fact or law.”); *cf. Premier Tr. of Nevada, Inc. v. City of Albuquerque*, 2021-NMCA-004, ¶ 10, 482 P.3d 1261 (“[I]t is the appellant’s burden to demonstrate, by providing well-supported and clear arguments, that the district court has erred.” (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)).

**{3}** Accordingly, for the reasons stated in our notice of proposed disposition and herein, we affirm the ruling of the WCJ.

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

**J. MILES HANISEE, Chief Judge**

**WE CONCUR:**

**MEGAN P. DUFFY, Judge**

**SHAMMARA H. HENDERSON, Judge**