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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum Please also note that this electronic memorandum opinion may contain opinions. computer-generated errors or other deviations from the official paper version filed by the Court of Appeals and does not include the filing date. IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO 1 2 STATE OF NEW MEXICO, 3 Plaintiff-Appellee, $4 \mathbf{v}$ No. 33,799 5 MICHAEL ALDACO, Defendant-Appellant. 6 7 APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF EDDY COUNTY 8 James L. Shuler, District Judge 9 Hector H. Balderas, Attorney General 10 Margaret McLean, Assistant Attorney General 11 Santa Fe, NM 12 for Appellee 13 Jorge A. Alvarado, Chief Public Defender 14 Santa Fe, NM 15 for Appellant

MEMORANDUM OPINION

16

17 SUTIN, Judge.

Defendant appeals his conviction for commercial burglary. This Court issued **{1**} a stay before addressing the merits of the State's appeal, pending our decision in State 3 v. Archuleta, ___-NMCA-___, ___ P.3d ___ (No. 32,794, Oct. 27, 2014), cert. granted, 2015-NMCERT-__, ___ P.3d ___ (No. 35,005, Jan. 26, 2015), the first of many cases raising the same issue 6 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 8 reverse. [Ct. App. file] 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 16 granting the petition does not affect the precedential value of an opinion of the Court of Appeals, unless otherwise ordered by the Supreme Court."). 18 | {2} In its response to our notice, the State simply objects to our proposed 19 disposition without elaboration. [MIO 1] We continue to believe that there are no

1	
1	material factual distinctions to remove this case from the control of our Opinion in
2	Archuleta. For the reasons stated in our notice, we reverse Defendant's conviction.
3	{3} IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	
5	JONATHAN B. SUTIN, Judge
6	WE CONCUR:
7	TAMEC I MECHCIED I. I.
8	JAMES J. WECHSLER, Judge
9 10	MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge