This decision of the New Mexico Court of Appeals was not selected for publication in the New Mexico Appellate Reports. Refer to Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished decisions. Electronic decisions may contain computergenerated errors or other deviations from the official version filed by the Court of Appeals.

#### IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

No. A-1-CA-40538

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

٧.

## **EMMANUEL OLIVAS,**

Defendant-Appellant.

# APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF EDDY COUNTY Lisa B. Riley, District Judge

Hector H. Balderas, Attorney General Santa Fe, NM

for Appellee

Bennett J. Baur, Chief Public Defender MJ Edge, Assistant Appellate Defender Santa Fe, NM

for Appellant

### **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

### BOGARDUS, Judge.

- 1) Defendant appeals the revocation of his probation. In this Court's notice of proposed disposition, we proposed to summarily affirm. Defendant filed a memorandum in opposition, which we have duly considered. Remaining unpersuaded, we affirm.
- In his memorandum in opposition, Defendant maintains that the State failed to prove Defendant willfully violated the terms of his probation. Defendant, however, has not asserted any new facts, law, or argument that persuade us that our notice of proposed disposition was erroneous. See Hennessy v. Duryea, 1998-NMCA-036, ¶ 24,

124 N.M. 754, 955 P.2d 683 ("Our courts have repeatedly held that, in summary calendar cases, the burden is on the party opposing the proposed disposition to clearly point out errors in fact or law."); *State v. Mondragon*, 1988-NMCA-027, ¶ 10, 107 N.M. 421, 759 P.2d 1003 (stating that a party responding to a summary calendar notice must come forward and specifically point out errors of law and fact, and the repetition of earlier arguments does not fulfill this requirement), *superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in State v. Harris*, 2013-NMCA-031, ¶ 3, 297 P.3d 374.

- **(3)** Accordingly, for the reasons stated in our notice of proposed disposition and herein, we summarily affirm the district court's revocation order.
- {4} IT IS SO ORDERED.

KRISTINA BOGARDUS, Judge

WE CONCUR:

J. MILES HANISEE, Chief Judge

**ZACHARY A. IVES, Judge**