Ī	
	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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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. No. A-1-CA-35958
5	LOUIS GARCIA,
6	Defendant-Appellant.
	APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF LUNA COUNTY Daniel Viramontes, District Judge
	Hector H. Balderas, Attorney General Santa Fe, NM
11	for Appellee
13	Bennett J. Baur, Chief Public Defender Kathleen T. Baldridge, Assistant Appellate Defender Santa Fe, NM
15	for Appellant
16	MEMORANDUM OPINION
17	ZAMORA, Judge.
18	Defendant appeals from the sentence imposed by the district court on grounds
19	that it is excessive and constitutes cruel and unusual punishment. [Amended DS 3]

This Court's calendar notice proposed to summarily affirm. Defendant filed a memorandum in opposition, which we have duly considered. Remaining unpersuaded by Defendant's arguments, we affirm.

Defendant acknowledges that he was advised of the maximum penalties for the **{2}** charges to which he plead, and that his sentence is legal. [MIO 3] See State v. Vasquez, 2010-NMCA-041, ¶ 41, 148 N.M. 202, 232 P.3d 438 ("[T]here is no abuse of discretion if the sentence imposed is authorized by law."). Defendant also recognizes that by entering into a plea agreement, he waived his right to challenge the constitutionality of his sentence. [MIO 4] See State v. Chavarria, 2009-NMSC-020, 10 ¶ 9, 146 N.M. 251, 208 P.3d 896 ("[A] plea of guilty or nolo contendere, when voluntarily made after advice of counsel and with full understanding of the consequences, waives objections to prior defects in the proceedings and also operates 13 as a waiver of statutory or constitutional rights, including the right to appeal." (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)). Defendant nevertheless continues to argue that his sentence is unjust and excessive in light of his no contest plea, which 16 spared the child victim from the stress and grief of having to take the stand to testify 17 at trial, and considering he is a "hard-working man who did a lot of good for a lot of 18 people." [Amended DS 4-5; MIO 3] Defendant has not presented any facts, law or

ı	
1	argument to persuade this Court that our notice of proposed disposition was
2	erroneous. See State v. Mondragon, 1988-NMCA-027, ¶ 10, 107 N.M. 421, 759 P.2d
3	1003 (stating that a party responding to a summary calendar notice must come forward
4	and specifically point out errors of law and fact, and the repetition of earlier arguments
5	does not fulfill this requirement).
6	For these reasons, and those stated in this Court's calendar notice, we affirm.
7	{4} IT IS SO ORDERED.
0	
8 9	M. MONICA ZAMORA, Judge
10	WE CONCUR:
11 12	LINDA M. VANZI, Chief Judge
13 14	MICHAEL E. VIGIL, Judge
	3