

SUPREME COURT OF NORTH DAKOTA

Wright v. Holmes

2025 ND 212 · No. No. 20250179 · Decided December 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The North Dakota Supreme Court affirmed a disorderly conduct restraining order against Terica Holmes. The court summarily affirmed under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(8) because Holmes's self-represented appellate brief failed to satisfy minimum requirements, including providing a statement of facts, a standard of review, and record citations.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

IN THE SUPREME COURT STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA 2025 ND 212 Jessica Wright, and Jessica Wright on behalf of G.W., Petitioners and Appellees v. Terica Holmes, Respondent and Appellant No. 20250179 Appeal from the District Court of Stark County, Southwest Judicial District, the Honorable Rhonda R. Ehliis, Judge. AFFIRMED. Per Curiam. Jared W. Gietzen, Dickinson, N.D., for petitioners and appellees; submitted on brief.

Terica Holmes, self-represented, Dickinson, N.D., respondent and appellant; submitted on brief. Wright v. Holmes No. 20250179 Per Curiam. [¶1] Terica Holmes appeals from a disorderly conduct restraining order. She argues the restraining order violates her constitutional rights because it is “retaliatory and malicious.” She also contends the restraining order rested on “untrue hearsay.” Holmes’s brief does not contain a statement of facts, specify a standard of review, or provide citations to the record showing the issues preserved for review.

See N.D.R.App.P. 28(b) (setting forth minimum brief requirements). We summarily affirm under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(8) because Holmes’s brief does not meet the minimum requirements. [¶2] Jon J. Jensen, C.J. Daniel J. Crothers Lisa Fair McEvers Jerod E. Tufte Douglas A. Bahr 1