	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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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.
1	IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2	STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
3	Plaintiff-Appellee,
4	v. <b>NO. 34,699</b>
5	AMANDA ARCHULETA,
6	Defendant-Appellant.
	APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BERNALILLO COUNTY Christina Argyres, District Judge
	Hector H. Balderas, Attorney General Santa Fe, NM
11	for Appellee
13 14 15	Jorge A. Alvarado, Chief Public Defender Santa Fe, NM Sergio J. Viscoli, Assistant Public Defender Albuquerque, NM
16	for Appellant
17	MEMORANDUM OPINION
18	ZAMORA, Judge.
19	Defendant has appealed from the revocation of her probation. We previously
20	issued a notice of proposed summary disposition in which we proposed to uphold the

district court's decision. Defendant has filed a memorandum in opposition. After due consideration, we remain unpersuaded. We therefore affirm.

The pertinent background information was previously set forth in the notice of **{2**} proposed summary disposition. We will avoid undue repetition here, and focus instead on the content of the memorandum in opposition.

3

6

- Defendant continues to argue that the district court abused its discretion by **{3**} 7 revoking her probation. [DS 6; MIO 5-6] However, in light of Defendant's "pattern of completing [only] one aspect of the program at a time and only after warrants had 9 to be issued[,]" [MIO 4] as well as Defendant's ultimate failure to demonstrate 10 fulfillment of the counseling requirement, [MIO 4-6] the district court acted well within its discretion. See NMSA 1978, § 31-21-15(B) (1989) (giving the court broad discretion when a probation violation is established). Although we understand 13 Defendant to suggest that lesser sanctions would have been appropriate, [MIO 6] the 14 district court reasonably differed in its assessment. In the final analysis, the district 15 court was under no obligation to continue Defendant's probation. See State v. 16 *Mendoza* 1978-NMSC-048, ¶ 5, 91 N.M. 688, 579 P.2d 1255 ("Probation is not a 17 right but a privilege.").
- Accordingly, for the reasons stated above and in the notice of proposed 18 19 summary disposition, we affirm.

1	{5} IT IS SO ORDERED.
2 3	M. MONICA ZAMORA, Judge
<ul><li>4</li><li>5</li><li>6</li></ul>	JAMES J. WECHSLER, Judge
7 8	RODERICK T. KENNEDY, Judge
	3