

1 **WECHSLER, Judge.**

2 {1} Defendant Stacy Romero appeals from her conviction of criminal damage to
3 property (less than \$1,000). In our notice of proposed summary disposition, we
4 proposed to affirm. Defendant has filed a memorandum in opposition, which this
5 Court has duly considered. We do not find Defendant's arguments persuasive, and
6 therefore, we affirm.

7 {2} Defendant's sole contention on appeal is that there was insufficient evidence
8 to support her conviction. [DS 3] We hold that there was sufficient evidence. Alex
9 Romero testified that, while he was home on September 13, 2012, he heard a loud
10 noise that sounded like glass shattering; he went to the front of his house and saw a
11 window had been shattered by a brick, which was similar to the bricks that were in
12 front of his house; and he observed Defendant getting into her BMW and driving
13 away in a hurry. [DS 2; MIO 1, 3; RP 31] Mr. Romero further testified that the
14 damage to his window was less than \$1,000. [RP 31]

15 {3} In her memorandum in opposition, Defendant continues to argue that this
16 evidence was insufficient to support her conviction because she testified that she did
17 not throw the brick, nobody saw her with a brick, she had no reason to throw the
18 brick, and the officer who investigated the case did not check the brick for
19 fingerprints. [MIO 3; *see also* DS 2-3] However, she provides no authority that

1 would permit this Court to reweigh the evidence in the manner that she proposes.

2 {4} As we stated in our notice, we view the evidence in the light most favorable to
3 the verdict, indulge all reasonable inferences and resolve all conflicts in the evidence
4 in favor of that verdict, and do not reweigh the evidence. *See State v. Cunningham*,
5 2000-NMSC-009, ¶ 26, 128 N.M. 711, 998 P.2d 176; *State v. Collins*,
6 2007-NMCA-106, ¶ 29, 142 N.M. 419, 166 P.3d 480. “Contrary evidence supporting
7 acquittal does not provide a basis for reversal because the [factfinder] is free to reject
8 [the d]efendant’s version of the facts.” *State v. Rojo*, 1999-NMSC-001, ¶ 19, 126
9 N.M. 438, 971 P.2d 829. Accordingly, we hold that the evidence was sufficient.

10 {5} For the reasons stated in this opinion and in our notice of proposed summary
11 disposition, we affirm.

12 {6} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13
14

JAMES J. WECHSLER, Judge

15 **WE CONCUR:**

16
17

MICHAEL D. BUSTAMANTE, Judge

1 **MICHAEL E. VIGIL, Judge**