	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 Please see Rule 12-405 NMRA for restrictions on the citation of unpublished memorandum opinions.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-37037
5	CRYSTAL GOINS,
6	Defendant-Appellant.
	APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF EDDY COUNTY Lisa B. Riley, District Judge
	Hector H. Balderas, Attorney General Santa Fe, NM
11	for Appellee
13	Bennet J. Baur, Chief Public Defender William A. O'Connell, Assistant Appellate Defender Santa Fe, NM
15	for Appellant
16	MEMORANDUM OPINION
17	VANZI, Chief Judge.
18	Defendant Crystal Goins appeals her conviction for driving while under the
19	influence of liquor and/or drugs. In this Court's notice of proposed disposition, we

proposed to summarily affirm. Defendant filed a memorandum in opposition, which we have duly considered. Remaining unpersuaded, we affirm. 3 Defendant continues to argue that officers lacked reasonable suspicion to **{2}** conduct an investigatory stop of her at Allsup's following two 911 telephone calls. [See generally MIO; see also DS 3-4] However, Defendant has not presented any new facts, authority, or argument to persuade this Court that our notice of proposed 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 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point out errors of 13 | law and fact, and the repetition of earlier arguments does not fulfill this requirement), 14 superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in State v. Harris, 2013-NMCA-031, 15 ¶ 3, 297 P.3d 374. Accordingly, for the reasons stated in our notice of proposed disposition and 16 **{3}** herein, we affirm Defendant's conviction. 18 4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19

1	LINDA M. VANZI, Chief Judge
2	WE CONCUR:
3 4	J. MILES HANISEE, Judge
5 6	EMIL J. KIEHNE, Judge