

STATE V. CARTER

This memorandum opinion was not selected for publication in the New Mexico Reports. Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions. Please also note that this electronic memorandum opinion may contain computer-generated errors or other deviations from the official paper version filed by the Court of Appeals and does not include the filing date.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.
THADDEUS CARTER,
Defendant-Appellant.

NO. 31,529

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEW MEXICO

November 28, 2011

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF SAN JUAN COUNTY, Thomas J. Hynes,
District Judge

COUNSEL

Gary K. King, Attorney General, Santa Fe, NM, for Appellee

Jacqueline L. Cooper, Acting Chief Public Defender, Kathleen T. Badridge, Assistant Appellate Defender, Santa Fe, NM, for Appellant

JUDGES

CYNTHIA A. FRY, Judge. WE CONCUR: LINDA M. VANZI, Judge, TIMOTHY L. GARCIA, Judge

AUTHOR: CYNTHIA A. FRY

MEMORANDUM OPINION

FRY, Judge.

Defendant appeals the denial of his motion to suppress evidence. In our notice, we proposed to affirm. Defendant has timely responded. We have considered his arguments and, finding them unpersuasive, affirm.

In our notice, we proposed to conclude that because police had a felony arrest warrant for Defendant, they could go into his girlfriend's house to arrest him. *See State v. Krout*, 100 N.M. 661, 662-63, 674 P.2d 1121, 1122-23 (1984) (holding that an arrest warrant supported by probable cause provides a proper basis for police to enter a dwelling where the defendant resides when there is reason to believe that the defendant is within). Defendant recognizes this authority, but continues to argue that this only applies to the Defendant's home and not a third party's home. As we pointed out in our notice, the cases relied on by Defendant to support this argument are unpersuasive. [CN 3] Defendant does not point us to any other authorities. Thus, we rely on *Krout* to support the officers' authority to enter the residence to arrest Defendant. He was not only known to be at the residence, but he was seen there through an open door.

For the reasons stated herein and in the calendar notice, we affirm.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

CYNTHIA A. FRY, Judge

WE CONCUR:

LINDA M. VANZI, Judge

TIMOTHY L. GARCIA, Judge