

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

Anthony J. Stonecipher, Claudene Stonecipher, and Vanessa Stonecipher, a minor, by and through her next friend and father, Anthony J. Stonecipher v. City of Alamogordo, et al.

Stonecipher · No. No. 2:25-cv-01262-MIS-DLM · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of New Mexico issues an omnibus order addressing Plaintiffs’ objections, motions for stays, temporary restraining orders, disability accommodations, electronic filing, page limits, and issuance and service of summonses. The court stays proceedings until April 30, 2026, denies the requested temporary restraining orders, requires an amended complaint of no more than 75 pages, and grants in part the requests concerning electronic filing and summonses. The order also tolls service deadlines and extends Defendants’ response deadline after service.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of New Mexico
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Margaret Strickland
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of New Mexico
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	No. 2:25-cv-01262-MIS-DLM
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Omnibus order resolving plaintiffs' objections, motions for reconsideration, motions for temporary restraining orders, requests for accommodations, motions concerning electronic filing and summons issuance, and related requests in a newly filed civil-rights action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed objections to a magistrate judge's non-dispositive pretrial orders and motions for reconsideration; the opinion does not state a specific standard of review.
PARTIES	Anthony J. Stonecipher, Claudene Stonecipher, Vanessa Stonecipher, a minor, by and through her next friend and father, Anthony J. Stonecipher v. City of Alamogordo, Judge Bryant, Judge Ochoa, Bryan C. Garcia, Jessica L. Czajkowski, other defendants

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether proceedings should be stayed for an additional period based on Anthony Stonecipher's anticipated neurosurgery and medical recovery.
2. Whether the Anti-Injunction Act permitted injunctions staying related state-court proceedings.
3. Whether plaintiffs were entitled to temporary restraining orders against state-court judges and attorneys participating in state-court proceedings.
4. Whether the court properly required a compliant amended complaint of no more than 75 pages and struck noncompliant filings.
5. Whether plaintiffs were entitled to a blanket prohibition on live proceedings as a disability accommodation.
6. Whether the Clerk should issue properly completed summonses and whether service deadlines should be tolled.
7. Whether a pro se, nonlawyer parent could represent claims belonging to a minor child.

HOLDINGS

1. The court partially sustained Anthony Stonecipher's objection and stayed all proceedings until April 30, 2026, while allowing a later motion for extension.
2. The court denied the requested temporary restraining orders staying state-court proceedings because plaintiffs did not establish any exception to the Anti-Injunction Act.
3. Plaintiffs were not entitled to injunctive relief against the defendant state-court judges because they did not show that a declaratory decree had been violated or that declaratory relief was unavailable.
4. The court denied the temporary restraining order against defendants Garcia and Czajkowski because plaintiffs did not show that their filing of documents in state-court proceedings caused irreparable harm.
5. The court overruled plaintiffs' objection and denied reconsideration concerning the 75-page limit, formatting requirements, and striking of noncompliant filings; plaintiffs were required to file an amended complaint complying with the Federal and Local Rules of Civil Procedure.
6. The court declined to impose a blanket prohibition on live proceedings or require that all matters be decided solely on written submissions, while permitting plaintiff to seek specific accommodations by motion.
7. A nonlawyer parent proceeding pro se may not represent the claims of a minor child in federal court; the court deferred a final ruling regarding Vanessa Stonecipher until an amended complaint was filed.
8. The court partially granted the motion concerning summonses, ordered the Clerk to process and issue properly completed summonses, and tolled service until 60 days after the stay expired or was lifted.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs alleged civil-rights violations by Alamogordo police officers, state-court judges and employees, attorneys, and others. Anthony Stonecipher alleged that he was disabled following surgical removal of both frontal lobes of his brain and sought stays, disability accommodations, injunctive relief against state-court

proceedings, electronic-filing access, and issuance of summonses. Plaintiffs filed an unusually lengthy complaint and motions that did not comply with applicable pleading and page-limit requirements.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed a 619-page pro se complaint asserting civil-rights, ADA, injunctive, declaratory, and tort-related claims, along with numerous motions. Magistrate Judge Damian L. Martinez identified filing deficiencies, imposed a 75-page limit for an amended complaint, struck noncompliant filings, addressed stays and summonses, and ruled on accommodation and electronic-filing requests. The district court partially sustained one objection, denied or partially granted various motions, continued a stay through April 30, 2026, ordered a compliant amended complaint by May 30, 2026, and deferred some issues.

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-new-mexico/2026/anthony-j-stonecipher-claudene-stonecipher-and-vanessa-djiofh60>