

1 proposed to summarily affirm. Defendant filed a memorandum in opposition, which
2 we have duly considered. Remaining unpersuaded, we affirm.

3 {2} Defendant continues to argue that officers lacked reasonable suspicion to
4 conduct an investigatory stop of her at Allsup's following two 911 telephone calls.
5 [See generally MIO; see also DS 3-4] However, Defendant has not presented any new
6 facts, authority, or argument to persuade this Court that our notice of proposed
7 disposition was incorrect. [See generally MIO] See *Hennessy v. Duryea*,
8 1998-NMCA-036, ¶ 24, 124 N.M. 754, 955 P.2d 683 ("Our courts have repeatedly
9 held that, in summary calendar cases, the burden is on the party opposing the proposed
10 disposition to clearly point out errors in fact or law."); *State v. Mondragon*,
11 1988-NMCA-027, ¶ 10, 107 N.M. 421, 759 P.2d 1003 (stating that a party responding
12 to a summary calendar notice must come forward and specifically point out errors of
13 law and fact, and the repetition of earlier arguments does not fulfill this requirement),
14 *superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in State v. Harris*, 2013-NMCA-031,
15 ¶ 3, 297 P.3d 374.

16 {3} Accordingly, for the reasons stated in our notice of proposed disposition and
17 herein, we affirm Defendant's conviction.

18 {4} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

LINDA M. VANZI, Chief Judge

1

2 **WE CONCUR:**

3

4 **J. MILES HANISEE, Judge**

5

6 **EMIL J. KIEHNE, Judge**