

| |
|-------------------------|
| STATE V. WOODARD |
|-------------------------|

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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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-Appellant,
v.
JEFFREY WOODARD,
Defendant-Appellee.

NO. 34,009

COURT OF APPEALS OF NEW MEXICO

March 16, 2015

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

COUNSEL

Hector H. Balderas, Attorney General, Margaret McLean, Assistant Attorney General,
Santa Fe, NM, for Appellant

Jorge A. Alvarado, Chief Public Defender, Santa Fe, NM, for Appellee

JUDGES

LINDA M. VANZI, Judge. WE CONCUR: CYNTHIA A FRY, Judge, M. MONICA
ZAMORA, Judge

AUTHOR: LINDA M. VANZI

MEMORANDUM OPINION

VANZI, Judge.

{1} The State appeals from the district court's order dismissing charges of commercial burglary and conspiracy to commit commercial burglary. This Court issued a stay before addressing the merits of the State's appeal, pending our decision in *State*

v. Archuleta, ___-NMCA-___, ___ P.3d ___ (No. 32,794, Oct. 27, 2014), *cert. granted*, 2015-NMCERT-___ (No. 35,005, Jan. 26, 2015), the first of many cases raising the same issue relative to the charge of commercial burglary. Relying on our opinion in *Archuleta*, we lifted the stay and issued a notice of proposed summary disposition, proposing to affirm on December 19, 2014. [CN 1] The State has filed a response, objecting to our notice and requesting that we hold this appeal in abeyance or provide the State with a reasonable opportunity to seek guidance from the New Mexico Supreme Court on all pending appeals controlled by our opinion in *Archuleta*. [MIO 1-2] We have provided the State with such an opportunity, and the Supreme Court has denied the State a stay or other remedy that would suspend the precedential value of *Archuleta*. Thus, pursuant to Rule 12-405(C) NMRA, we apply *Archuleta*. See Rule 12-405(C) (“A petition for a writ of certiorari filed pursuant to Rule 12-502 NMRA or a Supreme Court order granting the petition does not affect the precedential value of an opinion of the Court of Appeals, unless otherwise ordered by the Supreme Court.”).

{2} In its response to our notice, the State simply objects to our proposed disposition without elaboration. [MIO 1] We continue to believe that there are no material factual distinctions to remove this case from the control of our opinion in *Archuleta*. For the reasons stated in our notice, we affirm the district court’s order granting Defendant’s motion to dismiss.

{3} IT IS SO ORDERED.

LINDA M. VANZI, Judge

WE CONCUR:

CYNTHIA A FRY, Judge

M. MONICA ZAMORA, Judge