

**PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR THE
DISTRICT COURTS
PROPOSAL 2025-030**

March 6, 2025

The Supreme Court Clerk's Office has recommended amendments to Rule 1-077.1 NMRA for the Supreme Court's consideration.

If you would like to comment on the proposed amendments set forth below before the Court takes final action, you may do so by either submitting a comment electronically through the Supreme Court's website at <https://supremecourt.nmcourts.gov/rules-forms-files/rules-forms/open-for-comment/> or sending your written comments by mail, email, or fax to:

Elizabeth A. Garcia, Chief Clerk of Court
New Mexico Supreme Court
P.O. Box 848
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-0848
rules.supremecourt@nmcourts.gov
505-827-4837 (fax)

Your comments must be received by the Clerk on or before April 5, 2025, to be considered by the Court. Please note that any submitted comments may be posted on the Supreme Court's website for public viewing.

1-077.1. Expungement.

A. **Scope of Rule.** This rule governs proceedings for expungement of arrest and public records under the Criminal Record Expungement Act, NMSA 1978, Sections 29-3A-1 to -9 [~~NMSA 1978~~].

B. **Commencement of Action.** An expungement proceeding is commenced by filing a civil petition in the appropriate district court as follows:

(1) A petition seeking expungement of arrest records or public records wrongfully identifying a person therein as a result of identity theft under NMSA 1978, Section 29-3A-3 [~~NMSA 1978~~] shall be filed in the district court of the county where the charges originated, or the arrest occurred, or where a conviction was entered.

(2) A petition seeking expungement of arrest records and public records where there is no conviction under NMSA 1978, Section 29-3A-4 [~~NMSA 1978~~] shall be filed in the district court for the county where the charges originated or the arrest occurred.

(3) An action seeking expungement of records upon conviction under NMSA 1978, Section 29-3A-5 [~~NMSA 1978~~] shall be filed in the district court in the county in which petitioner's conviction was entered.

(4) An action seeking expungement of an arrest, release without conviction, or conviction of a charge that the petitioner believes is legally invalid due to the passage of the Cannabis Regulation Act and is eligible for automatic expungement under NMSA 1978,

Section 29-3A-8 [~~NMSA-1978~~], which automatic expungement has not occurred, shall be filed in the district court in which the arrest occurred, the charges were originally filed, or the conviction was entered. There shall be no filing fee for an action commenced under the automatic expungement provisions of Section 29-3A-8.

(5) A petition to expunge may contain a request to expunge arrest records and public records pertaining to any number of arrests, criminal charges filed without arrest, and/or convictions in a single judicial district.

C. **Sealing of Petition.** A petition for expungement of records upon release without conviction shall be filed under seal and subject to the requirements of Rule 1-079 NMRA and the provisions of this rule. If the petition seeks both expungement of records upon conviction and expungement of records upon release without conviction, the district court shall treat the petition as one filed for expungement of records upon conviction and the petition shall not be subject to Rule 1-079 NMRA.

D. **Contents of Petition.** A petition for expungement shall conform with the requirements of Form 4-951 NMRA (expungement of arrest records and public records upon identity theft), Form 4-452 NMRA (expungement of arrest records and public records upon release without conviction), Form 4-953 NMRA (expungement of arrest records and public records upon conviction), or Form 4-954 NMRA (automatic expungement of arrest records and public records), the use of which are mandatory in expungement proceedings.

E. **Service.** Service of the petition and attachments thereto is only required in cases seeking expungement of records upon release without conviction and upon conviction.

(1) A petition for expungement of records upon release without conviction and all attachments thereto shall be served upon:

(a) the district attorney for the county in which the arrest was made or the criminal charge or proceeding filed; and

(b) the New Mexico Department of Public Safety.

(2) A petition for expungement of records upon conviction and all attachments thereto shall be served upon:

(a) the district attorney for the county in which the conviction was entered;

(b) the New Mexico Department of Public Safety; and

(c) the law enforcement agency that arrested the petitioner.

(3) Service under this section is made by first-class United States mail. Petitioner shall file a certificate of service with the district court.

(4) Subsequent pleadings shall be served in accordance with Rules 1-005, 1-005.1, or 1-005.2 NMRA.

F. **Court action upon insufficient petition.** If the court concludes that the initial petition does not comply with the provisions of this rule and the applicable form, the court may enter an order granting the petitioner leave to file a proper amended petition within sixty (60) days from entry of the order. If the petition fails to comply with the order or this rule, the court may dismiss the petition without prejudice.

G. **Response.**

(1) Within sixty (60) days from service of the petition, the parties entitled to notice of the proceeding by way of service of the petition, as identified in Paragraph E of this rule, shall file and serve specific objections (Form 4-957 NMRA) or shall file a Notice of Non-

Objection (Form 4-958 NMRA). A responding party filing and serving a Notice of Non-Objection shall be excused from further participation in the proceeding.

(2) If a party objects to a petition for expungement of arrest records or public records without conviction on the basis of the contents of petitioner's Federal Bureau of Investigation's record of arrests and prosecutions, the objecting party shall provide petitioner with a copy of the FBI Rap sheet, at no charge, at the time of filing the objection.

H. **Notice of Completion of Briefing.** For petitions seeking expungement of records upon release without conviction and upon conviction, petitioner must file a notice of completion of briefing (Form 4-959 NMRA (upon release without conviction) or Form 4-960 NMRA (upon conviction)) after expiration of the objection period set forth in Paragraph G of this rule. Petitioner shall serve the notice of completion of briefing on all parties that have filed an objection.

Petitioner shall attach completed Form 4-960.2 NMRA (affirmation in support of expungement of records, upon release without conviction) or Form 4-960.3 NMRA (affirmation in support of expungement of records, upon conviction) to the notice of completion of briefing. If Form 4-960.2 or Form 4-960.3 contains information regarding arrests, charges without arrest, and/or convictions that occurred subsequent to the filing of the petition, the parties shall have twenty (20) days after service of the notice of completion of briefing and attachments thereto to file additional objections to the petition for expungement.

I. **Burden of Proof.** Petitioner bears the burden of proving the requirements for statutory expungement.

J. **Hearings.** No hearing on the merits will be set in an expungement action prior to the filing and service of the notice of completion of briefing as set forth in Paragraph H of this rule.

If the petition is filed under NMSA 1978, Section 29-3A-3 [~~NMSA 1978~~] (expungement of records upon identity theft) or NMSA 1978, Section 29-3A-4 [~~NMSA 1978~~] (expungement of records upon release without conviction) and no objections to the petition are filed, the court may decide the petition on the pleadings and affirmation (if applicable) without a hearing.

If the petition is filed under NMSA 1978, Section 29-3A-8 [~~NMSA 1978~~], the court may decide the petition on the pleadings without a hearing.

If the petition is filed under NMSA 1978, Section 29-3A-5 [~~NMSA 1978~~] (expungement of records upon conviction), the court shall hold a hearing to determine whether petitioner has established that the requirements of NMSA 1978, Section 29-3A-5(C) [~~NMSA 1978~~] have been met.

Any party wishing to participate in any hearing by telephonic or other electronic means, may do so by giving notice to the court and the other parties as provided for in the petition and objection forms. A motion and order for telephonic or electronic appearance shall not be required. The court may order any party to attend a hearing in-person.

K. **Orders.** When there is a hearing on a petition for expungement, the court shall issue an order within sixty (60) days of the hearing. Any order requiring the expungement of arrest and public records shall allow a minimum of sixty (60) days to complete the expungement. Any order granting a petition shall require that the civil expungement proceeding be expunged. The court shall not expunge court records earlier than 30-days from entry of its order of expungement.

L. **Service of Orders on the Merits.** On granting a petition for expungement, the court shall cause a copy of an order on a petition for expungement to be delivered to all relevant law enforcement agencies and courts. The order shall prohibit all relevant law enforcement

agencies and lower courts from releasing copies of the records to any persons, except as authorized by the Criminal Records Expungement Act, or on order of the court. If there are related records maintained at an appellate court, the order shall be served on the appellate court and should identify the related appellate court case. On receipt of the order, the appellate court shall review the order and expunge the requested records, if appropriate.

M. **Mandatory Forms.** The use of Forms 4-951 to -960.3 NMRA, as appropriate, is mandatory in expungement proceedings.

[Provisionally adopted by Supreme Court Order No. 21-8300-033, effective for all cases filed or pending on or after January 28, 2022; as amended by Supreme Court Order No. _____, effective for all cases pending or filed on or after _____.]

Committee commentary. —

2021 Amendment to Rule 1-004 NMRA

The Supreme Court has concluded that in the context of proceedings under the Criminal Record Expungement Act, NMSA 1978, Sections 29-3A-1 to -9 (2019, as amended 2021), if the petitioner serves notice of the petition as required by Paragraph F of Rule 1-077.1 NMRA and subsequently affirms that service was made in accordance with this rule, *see* Form 4-955 NMRA (certificate of service, expungement of records upon release without conviction) or Form 4-956 NMRA (certificate of service, expungement of records upon conviction), such service satisfies the requirements of due process because the recipients of the notice must either file objections or file a “Notice of Non-Objection” before the district court holds a hearing pursuant to Section 29-3A-4(E) or Section 29-3A-5(C).

Section 29-3A-3(D) (expungement of records upon identity theft); due process issue

Section 29-3A-3(D) provides that “Aft er notice to and a hearing for all interested parties and in compliance with all applicable law, the court shall insert in the records the correct name and other identifying information of the offender, if known or ascertainable, in lieu of the name of the person wrongly identified.” Identity theft is a crime. *See, e.g.,* NMSA 1978, § 30-16-24.1 (2009) (theft of identity; obtaining identity by electronic fraud). It would be a violation of due process for the court in a civil proceeding to publicly declare that it found a person guilty of the crime of identity theft and to identify in public records the name and identifying information of the offender, particularly when the statute does not require notice of the proceeding be given to the alleged wrongdoer. For this reason, Rule 1-077.1 omits requirements related to the statutory provision quoted above.

Rule 1-077.1(G)

Rule 1-077.1(G) provides that parties entitled to notice of these proceedings must file and serve specific objections or a Notice of Non-Objection within sixty days of service of the petition. This time limit is contrary to Section 29-3A-4(B), which provides for a thirty-day response time for filing objections to a petition seeking expungement of records upon release without conviction. Rule 1-077.1(G) controls because the Supreme Court can modify a procedural provision in a statute by adopting a contrary rule. *Lovelace Med. Ctr. v. Mendez*, 1991-NMSC-002, ¶ 15, 111 N.M. 336, 805 P.2d 603 (“[L]egislative rules relating to pleading, practice and procedure in the courts, particularly where those rules relate to court management or housekeeping functions, may be modified by a subsequent rule promulgated by the Supreme Court.”); *see also id.* ¶ 10 (“[T]here are good reasons for construing [statutory time limits] simply as the legislative adoption of a housekeeping rule to assist the courts with the management of their cases, [which] have effect unless and until waived by a court in a particular case or modified by a rule of this Court on the same subject.”).

Rule 1-077.1(J)

Rule 1-077.1(J) provides that if no objections are filed, the district court may decide a petition for expungement of records upon identity theft, § 29-3A-3, or for expungement of records upon release without conviction, § 29-3A-4, without a hearing. This conflicts with Section 29-3A-3(B), which provides that the district court shall issue an order “after a hearing” on a petition for expungement of records upon identity theft and with Section 29-3A-4(E), which provides likewise in the context of a petition for expungement of records upon release without conviction. Rule 1-077.1(J) controls because the Supreme Court can modify a procedural provision in a statute by adopting a contrary rule. *Lovelace Med. Ctr.*, 1991-NMSC-002, ¶ 15 (“[L]egislative rules relating to pleading, practice and procedure in the courts, particularly where those rules relate to court management or housekeeping functions, may be modified by a subsequent rule promulgated by the Supreme Court.”).

Rule 1-077.1(K)

Rule 1-077.1(K) provides that the district court shall issue an order within sixty (60) days of an expungement hearing. This time limit is contrary to Section 29-3A-4(E) and Section 29-3A-5(C), which require the district court to issue an order within thirty (30) days of certain expungement hearings. For the reasons stated above in the committee commentary to Rule 1-077.1(G), the time limits in Rule 1-077.1(K) control.

[Provisionally adopted by Supreme Court Order No. 21-8300-033, effective for all cases filed or pending on or after January 28, 2022.]



**New Mexico
Courts**

Alyssa Segura <supams@nmcourts.gov>

[nmsupremecourtclerk-grp] Second Judicial District Court's Comments on 2025 Rulemaking Proposals

Alison Orona <albdayg@nmcourts.gov>

Fri, Apr 4, 2025 at 3:15 PM

Reply-To: albdayg@nmcourts.gov

To: nmsupremecourtclerk@nmcourts.gov

Good afternoon Ms. Garcia,

Please see attached letter from Acting Chief Judge Levy regarding the Supreme Court's 2025 Rulemaking Proposals.

The letter comments on the following proposals:

- Proposal 2025-001 – CASA Duties
- Proposal 2025-002 – Improving Outcomes for Crossover Youth
- Proposal 2025-003 – Service by Social Media
- Proposal 2025-006 – Residential Foreclosures
- Proposal 2025-028 – Pronouns in UJIs
- Proposal 2025-030 – Orders of Expungement
- Proposal 2025-031 – Use of Personal Pronouns and Designated Salutations in Court Pleadings

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you. Respectfully,

Alison K. Orona (she/her)
Second Judicial District Court
General Counsel
400 Lomas Blvd. NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 841-7615

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. This communication may contain material that is protected by the attorney-client privilege. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the e-mail to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, faxing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail or by telephone at the number above and destroy the e-mail that you have received.



Second Judicial District Court Comments on 2025 Rulemaking.pdf
292K



**STATE OF NEW MEXICO
SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

400 Lomas Blvd. NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505)841-7425

5100 Second Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87107
(505) 841-5906

April 4, 2025

Elizabeth A. Garcia, Chief Clerk of the Court
New Mexico Supreme Court
P.O. Box 848
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-0848

Via email only to nmsupremecourtclerk@nmcourts.gov

Re: Comments on New Mexico Supreme Court 2025 Rulemaking:
Proposal 2025-001 – CASA Duties
Proposal 2025-002 – Improving Outcomes for Crossover Youth
Proposal 2025-003 – Service by Social Media
Proposal 2025-006 – Residential Foreclosures
Proposal 2025-028 – Pronouns in UJIs
Proposal 2025-030 – Orders of Expungement
Proposal 2025-031 – Use of Personal Pronouns and Designated Salutations in Court Pleadings

Dear Ms. Garcia,

As Acting Chief Judge of the Second Judicial District Court (the Court), I write to submit public comment to the 2025 proposed amendments to the Supreme Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure. My comments are on behalf of the Court as a whole, although individual judges and staff may submit their own additional comments, as well. My comments are as follows:

I. Proposal 2025-001 – CASA Duties

Proposal 2025-001 seeks to clarify CASA duties, including that "[a]ny report prepared by a CASA shall be served on the parties and the court at least five (5) days prior to the hearing at which it will be considered." However, Rule 10-164.1(F) and 10-164.2(G) do not include whether the CASA report is also intended to be filed into the case.

If the intention is to have the court file the report, I recommend clarifying language for the clerks, such as (addition in yellow):

. . . Any report prepared by the CASA shall be served on the parties and the court at least five (5) days prior to the hearing at which it will be considered. **Upon receipt, the court shall file into the case.** . . .

II. *Proposal 2025-002 – Improving Outcomes for Crossover Youth*

The Court appreciates the Committee’s work on providing a mechanism for parties in crossover youth matters to have notice of the other case(s). The Court understands the importance of this facilitation. However, the Court has concerns about (1) the Court’s responsibility to complete and send the notices, and (2) the proposed rules do not account for whether the filings would be sealed or the hearings would be sequestered.

(1) The Court’s Responsibility to Create and File the Notice is Contrary to a Court Clerk’s Responsibilities and Overly Burdens the Court.

Proposed Rule 10-172(A) requires the Court to complete and file a notice of crossover youth. This poses practical and logistical issues. First, the Court’s Clerk’s Office does not typically *create* filings. *See e.g.*, Rule 23-113(C)(3) (prohibiting court staff from “creating documents” when communicating with self-represented litigants). This proposed rule would require the Clerk’s Office to do independent research, complete a document, and then file and serve the document. This is contrary to the Clerk’s Office’s role, which is predominantly to be the record keeper. *See* NMSA 1978, § 34-1-6 (“The clerks of the . . . inferior courts, . . . shall seasonably record the judgments, rules, orders and other proceedings of the respective courts and make a complete alphabetical index thereto, issue and attest all processes issuing from their respective offices, and affix the seal of office thereto; they shall preserve the seal and other property belonging to their respective offices.”); *see e.g.*, *Ennis v. KMART Corp.*, 2001-NMCA-068, ¶ 10, 131 N.M. 32, 33 P.3d 32, (holding that a court clerk lacks the discretion to reject pleadings for technical violations).

Instead, the Clerk’s Office accepts filings, *see* Rule 1-005 NMRA, Rule 5-103 NMRA, issues subpoenas, *see* Rule 1-045(A) NMRA, Rule 5-511(A) NMRA, issues writs, *see* Rule 1-065, and issues summons, *see* Rule 1004(A) and (B) that the *parties* or *attorneys* provide to the Clerk’s Office. In these scenarios, the *parties* or *attorneys* create the document, not the court clerk. The Clerk’s Office does not do independent research on a case, create a document, and then file it.

In Indian Family Protection Act (IFPA) cases, the Child, Youth, and Families Department (CFYD) notifies the Clerk’s Office when a child custody proceeding involves an Indian child, and the Clerk’s Office will create and file the notice. *See* NMSA 1978, § 32A-28-5 (A) (“In a child custody proceeding when the court knows or has reason to know that an Indian child is involved, the department shall notify the parent, guardian or Indian custodian and the Indian child's tribe[. . .]”) (emphasis added). Similarly, in adoption cases, the party or attorney presents a completed application for a birth certificate and the clerk will certify it. *See* NMSA 1978, § 32A-5-38; Rule LR2-501 NMRA.

Additionally, the Court is concerned that the turnaround time under 10-172(B) is very quick – “within one (1) day of the filing of the petition or criminal information or indictment.” Requiring this on the Court would be a huge influx of work, with timelines that may not be feasible.

Furthermore, the proposed rule does not include any district-wide jurisdiction limitations. This would further increase the Court’s work load and create a new requirement for the Clerk’s Office to search across jurisdictions.

Putting this requirement on the Court – which in turn, will put it on court clerks – is impractical, contrary to Section 34-1-6, and improper. The Court and court clerks can only respond with the information parties to present to them; the Court is not an independent fact gatherer. The responsibility to determine if a child is involved in both a child welfare case and a delinquency case should be to the parties in the case, not to the Court, an independent and neutral arbitrator.

The Court appreciates the work of the Committee on this important issue. The Court respectfully recommends the Committee explore collaboration with other stakeholders, including CYFD. While this Court cannot speak on behalf of the judiciary as a whole, this Court would happy to discuss facilitation of getting CYFD the relevant information, such as daily or weekly reports if needed and if legally appropriate.

(2) The Proposal Does Not Account for When Filings Would be Sealed and When Hearings Would be Sequestered.

Since delinquency proceedings are open hearings and delinquency filings are not sealed, yet child welfare proceedings are sequestered and child welfare filings are sealed, I recommend adding language clarifying when filings are sealed pursuant to NMSA 1978, § 32A-4-33 (2022) and hearings are sequestered pursuant to NMSA 1978, § 32A-4-20 (B) (2014), such as:

E. Notice upon filing of petition for abuse and neglect or families in need of court-ordered services cases. If the child has a pending delinquency or criminal case, is under the supervision of juvenile probation, or is serving a commitment, and is subsequently placed in the CYFD’s legal custody in an abuse and neglect case or a family in need of court-ordered services case, the court shall notify juvenile probation and all parties to both the delinquency or criminal case and the child welfare case that the child is a crossover youth within ten (10) days of the entry of the order granting legal custody of the child in CYFD. The notice shall be automatically sealed.

F. Sequestered proceedings. Proceedings that discuss the crossover youth’s child welfare case shall be closed to the general public.

III. Proposal 2025-003 – Service by Social Media

The Court appreciates the Committee’s work on the proposed amendments to Rule 1-004 allowing service via email, social media, and text messages. The proposed rule change reflects the evolving nature of communication and the need for more effective, practical means of ensuring notice to parties. The goal of service is to ensure actual notice of a pending case. Service through alternative means, such as email, text message, and social media direct messaging is more likely to lead to actual notice than would publication of notice in a newspaper of general circulation. Many individuals use digital communication on a daily (or more frequently) basis. They are unlikely to see a legal notice in a newspaper but are likely to check their email or direct messages. By expanding acceptable service methods, the rule will be acknowledging this reality and making it more likely that people will have actual notice of cases wherein they are a named party.

The cost of publication is also prohibitive for many parties. For example, any of the cases filed in the Family Court division are grandparents or other family members seeking kinship guardianship of children. The parents are often impossible to locate and are certainly not providing child support to the parties filing for kinship guardianship. Requiring temporary guardians to pay almost \$300 (the cost of a legal notice in the Albuquerque Journal) would devastate their finances. The ability to serve parents through electronic means will hugely benefit the guardians, and therefore the children, in these cases. Instead of spending rent money on publishing, they can provide actual notice through an email or the equivalent.

Further, judges will still be required to determine if service was properly effectuated and the proposed rule changes still require judges to exercise discretion in determining whether electronic service is appropriate in a given case.

This rule change would modernize the service process, improve access to justice, and uphold due process by embracing the communication tools people already use daily.

However, with this said, the Court has concerns with the implementation of the rule.

1. First, the proposal requires the movant to submit admissible evidence (affidavit or other sworn testimony) that “the defendant is the sole owner of the specific social media account, e-mail address, or telephone number proposed for service and [that] the defendant, within thirty (30) days of the motion, has sent or received transmissions from that specific social media account, e-mail address, or telephone number proposed for service.” This standard seems impossible, as how will a party seeking to serve the party would have personal knowledge and/or a sufficient foundation to actually provide evidence of “sole ownership”? This standard appears to invite parties to be forced to attest to something that cannot possibly know.
2. Second, the Court recommends that the Committee change the requirement that the defendant have received the electronic service within 30 days *of the motion* to be within 30 days of entry of the order allowing such service of process.

3. Third, the language to be included in the email, text, social media message, etc. that “You have been sued” (etc.) is potentially harmful. It reads like a scam, and it may deter people from reading the message. This is especially true because the person making the service is not someone the recipient will likely know. Furthermore, the rule should also include a prohibition on serving the documents by hyperlink, e.g., “You have been sued. Click on this link to get your summons and complaint.” The actual documents must be served, and I think the rule should prohibit service by hyperlink.
4. Finally, the proposal does not appear to account for Domestic matters or Children’s Court matters for which the Rules of Civil Procedure apply. Rule 1-004 applies to all domestic matters, emancipations, adoptions, and expungements. However, the proposed language for the substance of the message to the party under new Subparagraph Rule 1-004(F)(4) assumes service only in the context of a civil lawsuit. That required language is “Important information—You have been sued. If you do not file a response to the lawsuit, the court may decide the case without hearing from you, and you could lose the case.” This language would be required for service by social media (Rule 1-004(F)(4)(c)(i)), email (Rule 1-004(F)(4)(d)(ii)-(iii)), and text message (Rule 1-004(F)(4)(e)(i)).

I would recommend a change to that standard required language to contemplate civil cases where “being sued” is not what is commonly understood to occur in those cases. For example, while perhaps technically accurate, a parent likely would not think of “being sued” for emancipation or adoption. Instead, the required language should read something like, “Important information—You ~~[have been sued]~~ are part of a court case. If you do not file a response ~~[to the lawsuit]~~, the court may decide the case without hearing from you, and you could lose the case.” I would further suggest a corresponding change to the email subject line under Rule 1-004(F)(4)(d)(ii) as such: “Important information—You are ~~[being sued]~~ are part of a court case.”

A smaller recommendation is to fix the errant “be” in Subparagraph (4)(a). “...service cannot ~~[be]~~ reasonably be made under Subparagraphs (F)(1), (F)(2), or (F)(3).”

IV. Proposal 2025-006 – Residential Foreclosures

The Court recommends adding the word “residential” in the last sentence within the body of Rule 1-003.3, as follows (addition in yellow):

1-003.3. Commencement of residential foreclosure action; certification of pre-filing notice required.

A certification of pre-filing notice, substantially in the form approved by the Supreme Court as Form 4-227 NMRA, shall be submitted with any complaint initiating a residential foreclosure action. Notwithstanding the provisions of Rule 1-005(F) NMRA, the clerk shall not accept for filing any residential foreclosure complaint that is not submitted with the certification form required under this rule.

V. Proposal 2025-028 – Pronouns in UJIs

The Court supports this proposal and has not further comments.

VI. Proposal 2025-030 – Orders of Expungement

This proposal includes a requirement that any appellate court with related records be served the order. The Court suggests that, in order for the Court to be able to find all related appellate case, the Committee also updates the form petition to include an additional paragraph for appellate cases. We recommend the following:

5. The following appellate court case(s) are related to Petitioner's Petition to Expunge:
New Mexico Court of Appeals case number(s): _____
New Mexico Supreme Court case number(s): _____

VII. Proposal 2025-031 – Use of Personal Pronouns and Designated Salutations in Court Pleadings

The Court supports this proposal and has not further comments.

Respectfully,



Jane C. Levy
Acting Chief Judge
Second Judicial District Court