STATE V. CAMPBELL

This memorandum opinion was not selected for publication in the New Mexico Appellate 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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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.
PETER CAMPBELL,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 32.462

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEW MEXICO

January 17, 2013

COUNSEL

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

Border Law Office, Dean E. Border, Albuquerque, NM, for Appellant

JUDGES

CYNTHIA A. FRY, Judge. WE CONCUR: TIMOTHY L. GARCIA, Judge, M. MONICA ZAMORA, Judge

AUTHOR: CYNTHIA A. FRY

MEMORANDUM OPINION

FRY, Judge.

Defendant, Peter Campbell, appeals from his convictions for battery on a police officer; aggravated battery on a police officer; assault on a peace officer; and resisting, evading or obstructing an officer. [DS 1, RP 62] Our calendar notice proposed to summarily affirm and Defendant filed a memorandum in opposition. We remain unpersuaded by Defendant's arguments and affirm.

BACKGROUND

Defendant continues to argue: (1) his convictions should be reversed because he was arrested without a warrant, which was required under the circumstances, (2) his convictions should be reversed because the jury was not instructed it had to find the officers were acting in the lawful discharge of their duties at the time of the alleged assault/battery, (3) he received ineffective assistance of counsel because his trial counsel did not raise either of the first two issues in the district court. [DS 6]

DISCUSSION

In his memorandum in opposition, Defendant does not raise any new legal arguments or new facts supporting his claims. *See State v. Sisneros*, 98 N.M. 201, 202-03, 647 P.2d 403, 404-05 (1982) (party opposing proposed disposition in calendar notice "must come forward and specifically point out errors in fact and law").

CONCLUSION

We remain persuaded that our proposed disposition was correct and, for the reasons stated in our calendar notice, affirm Defendant's convictions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

CYNTHIA A. FRY, Judge

WE CONCUR:

TIMOTHY L. GARCIA, Judge

M. MONICA ZAMORA, Judge