

STATE V. ROBERTS

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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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.
CHANCE BENTRY ROBERTS,
Defendant-Appellant.

NO. 31,109

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEW MEXICO

August 5, 2011

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF DOÑA ANA COUNTY, Mike Murphy,
District Court Judge

COUNSEL

Gary K. King, Attorney General, Andrew S. Montgomery, Assistant Attorney General,
Santa Fe, NM, for Appellee

Jacqueline Cooper, Acting Chief Public Defender, Will O'Connell, Assistant Appellate
Defender, Santa Fe, NM, Robert E. Tangora LLC, Robert E. Tangora, Santa Fe, NM, for
Appellant

JUDGES

MICHAEL E. VIGIL, Judge. WE CONCUR: JAMES J. WECHSLER, Judge, TIMOTHY L.
GARCIA, Judge.

AUTHOR: MICHAEL E. VIGIL.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

VIGIL, Judge.

Defendant appeals the district court's ex parte order of unsatisfactory discharge from probation. In our notice, we proposed to reverse and remand for issuance of an order of satisfactory discharge. In response, the State and Defendant have filed a joint motion to adopt the proposed disposition with the modification that instead of remand for issuance of an order of satisfactory discharge, the remand should be for dismissal of the charge.

We agree that the appropriate remedy in this case is dismissal pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 31-20-9 (1963). This section applies to deferred sentences and their expiration. Thus, "[w]henver the period of deferment expires, the defendant is relieved of any obligations imposed on him by the order of the court and has satisfied his criminal liability for the crime, [and] the court shall enter a dismissal of the criminal charges."

Here, based on the reasoning in the calendar notice, the period of deferment expired without entry of an order imposing sentence. Therefore, Defendant is entitled to have the charges against him dismissed. This case is reversed and remanded for entry of an order of dismissal of the charges.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

MICHAEL E. VIGIL, Judge

WE CONCUR:

JAMES J. WECHSLER, Judge

TIMOTHY L. GARCIA, Judge