

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of North Dakota
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Jon J. Jensen, C.J.; Daniel J. Crothers; Lisa Fair McEvers; Jerod E. Tufte; Douglas A. Bahr
JURISDICTION	Supreme Court of North Dakota
DECIDED	December 18, 2025
DOCKET	No. 20250179
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a disorderly conduct restraining order entered by the District Court of Stark County.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court did not specify a conventional standard of review and instead summarily affirmed under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(8) based on briefing deficiencies.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published North Dakota Supreme Court opinion
PARTIES	Terica Holmes v. Jessica Wright, Jessica Wright on behalf of G.W.

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- standard of review
- preservation of error
- constitutional law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- constitutional law
- restraining orders

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the appeal should be summarily affirmed because Holmes's brief failed to comply with the minimum requirements for an appellate brief.
2. Whether Holmes's constitutional and hearsay challenges to the disorderly conduct restraining order warranted relief.

HOLDINGS

1. An appeal may be summarily affirmed under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(8) when the appellant's brief does not meet the minimum requirements established by N.D.R.App.P. 28(b), including requirements concerning the statement of facts, standard of review, and record citations showing issue preservation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We summarily affirm under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(8) because Holmes's brief does not meet the minimum requirements." (¶1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case concerns a disorderly conduct restraining order against Terica Holmes. Holmes challenged the order as retaliatory and malicious and argued that it rested on untrue hearsay, but she did not provide a statement of facts, identify a standard of review, or cite the record to show preservation of the issues.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The district court entered a disorderly conduct restraining order. Terica Holmes appealed, asserting constitutional violations and reliance on untrue hearsay; the North Dakota Supreme Court summarily affirmed because her appellate brief failed to satisfy minimum briefing requirements.

DISPOSITION

affirmed