

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

3 {2} The pertinent background information was previously set forth in the notice of
4 proposed summary disposition. We will avoid undue repetition here, and focus instead
5 on the content of the memorandum in opposition.

6 {3} Defendant continues to argue that the district court abused its discretion by
7 revoking her probation. [DS 6; MIO 5-6] However, in light of Defendant's "pattern
8 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
11 within its discretion. *See* NMSA 1978, § 31-21-15(B) (1989) (giving the court broad
12 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.").

18 {4} Accordingly, for the reasons stated above and in the notice of proposed
19 summary disposition, we affirm.

1 {5} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

2

3

M. MONICA ZAMORA, Judge

4 **WE CONCUR:**

5

6 **JAMES J. WECHSLER, Judge**

7

8 **RODERICK T. KENNEDY, Judge**