

1 which would then be reduced by a uniform percentage depending on the income
2 level of the party paying the fee;

3 WHEREAS, Supreme Court Order No. 18-8500-001 required that the income
4 thresholds upon which the sliding fee scales are based be updated once every five
5 (5) years in light of the published federal poverty guidelines in effect at that time;
6 and

7 WHEREAS, the Court having considered the foregoing and being sufficiently
8 advised, Chief Justice David K. Thomson, Justice Michael E. Vigil, Justice C.
9 Shannon Bacon, Justice Julie J. Vargas, and Justice Briana H. Zamora concurring;

10 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, that the income thresholds set forth
11 in Supreme Court Order No. 18-8500-001 are hereby WITHDRAWN and
12 REPLACED by the following income thresholds, which shall be used for all sliding
13 fee scales submitted for this Court's review and approval under NMSA 1978,
14 Section 34-6-45(B) (2017):

- 15 1. Any party with gross income above \$79,800 shall pay one hundred
16 percent (100%) of the fee charged by a judicial district for
17 alternative dispute resolution program services;
- 18 2. Any party with gross income from \$79,800 to \$63,841 shall pay
19 eighty percent (80%) of the full fee charged by a judicial district for
20 alternative dispute resolution program services;

- 1 3. Any party with gross income from \$63,840 to \$55,861 shall pay
2 sixty percent (60%) of the full fee charged by a judicial district for
3 alternative dispute resolution program services;
- 4 4. Any party with gross income from \$55,860 to \$47,881 shall pay fifty
5 percent (50%) of the full fee charged by a judicial district for
6 alternative dispute resolution program services;
- 7 5. Any party with gross income from \$47,880 to \$31,921 shall pay
8 forty percent (40%) of the full fee charged by a judicial district for
9 alternative dispute resolution program services;
- 10 6. Any party with gross income from \$31,920 to \$23,941 shall pay
11 thirty percent (30%) of the full fee charged by a judicial district for
12 alternative dispute resolution program services;
- 13 7. Any party with gross income from \$23,940 to \$19,153 shall pay
14 twenty percent (20%) of the full fee charged by a judicial district for
15 alternative dispute resolution program services;
- 16 8. Any party with gross income of \$19,152 or less shall pay ten percent
17 (10%) of the full fee charged by a judicial district for alternative
18 dispute resolution program services;
- 19 9. For families of five (5) and above, the party shall receive an
20 additional ten percent (10%) discount on the full fee charged by a
21 judicial district for alternative dispute resolution program services,
22 provided that no party shall pay less than ten percent (10%) of the
23 full fee charged by a judicial district for alternative dispute
24 resolution program services unless otherwise ordered by the judge;
25 and
- 26 10. The income thresholds upon which the sliding fee scales are based
27 shall be updated in 2031, in light of the published federal poverty
28 guidelines in effect at that time, and shall be updated once every five
29 (5) years thereafter;

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a judicial district's revised sliding fee scale
2 for alternative dispute resolution program services shall be submitted to this Court
3 for review and approval, provided that any judicial district may elect to operate a
4 court-established alternative dispute resolution program without charging fees for
5 the services its program provides;

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any judicial district that charges fees for
7 domestic relations mediation, safe exchange, and supervised visitation services
8 under the Domestic Relations Mediation Act shall, in consultation and coordination
9 with the Administrative Office of the Courts, submit revised sliding fee scales for
10 this Court's review and approval that incorporate the income thresholds set forth in
11 this order and that otherwise comply with the requirements in Rule 1-125(I) NMRA
12 and the Domestic Relations Mediation Act; and

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the remaining provisions of Supreme Court
14 Order No. 18-8500-001 shall remain in effect.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.



16 WITNESS, the Honorable David K. Thomson, Chief
17 Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico,
18 and the seal of said Court this 5th day of March, 2026.

19 

20 Elizabeth A. Garcia, Chief Clerk of the Supreme Court
21 of the State of New Mexico