

STATE V. PACHECO

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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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.
JASON PACHECO,
Defendant-Appellant.**

No. 34,178

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEW MEXICO

April 7, 2015

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BERNALILLO COUNTY, Charles W.
Brown, District Judge

COUNSEL

Hector H. Balderas, Attorney General, Santa Fe, NM, for Appellee

Jorge A. Alvarado, Chief Public Defender, Steven J. Forsberg, Assistant Appellate Defender, Santa Fe, NM, for Appellant

JUDGES

MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge. WE CONCUR: MICHAEL E. VIGIL, Chief Judge,
JONATHAN B. SUTIN, Judge

AUTHOR: MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE

MEMORANDUM OPINION

BUSTAMANTE, Judge.

{1} Defendant Jason Pacheco appeals from the district court's affirmance of the metropolitan court's conviction for driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor. [DS 1; RP 1, 78] In this Court's notice of proposed disposition, we proposed to affirm

Defendant's convictions and adopt the memorandum opinion of the district court. [CN 1-2] Defendant filed a memorandum in opposition. We have given due consideration to the memorandum in opposition, and, remaining unpersuaded, we affirm Defendant's convictions.

{2} Defendant raises no new arguments apart from those that he made in his docketing statement [DS 11] and in the statement of the issues he filed with the district court in his on-record appeal [RP 49-60]. In this Court's notice of proposed disposition, we proposed to adopt the district court's thorough and well-reasoned memorandum opinion in response to Defendant's arguments. [CN 1-2; *see also* RP 69-75] Defendant has failed to raise any new arguments or issues to convince us to reconsider our proposed adoption of the district court's memorandum opinion. As such, all of the arguments in Defendant's memorandum in opposition have been addressed by this Court in its notice of proposed disposition and/or the district court's memorandum opinion this Court proposed to adopt in our notice of proposed disposition, and we refer Defendant to the responses therein. [See RP 69-75]

{3} Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in our notice of proposed disposition and herein, and for the reasons articulated in the memorandum opinion of the district court, we affirm Defendant's convictions.

{4} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge

WE CONCUR:

MICHAEL E. VIGIL, Chief Judge

JONATHAN B. SUTIN, Judge