

1 **IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO**

Court of Appeals of New Mexico
Filed 1/23/2023 9:41 AM

2 **STATE OF NEW MEXICO,**

3 Plaintiff-Appellee,



Mark Reynolds

4 v.

No. A-1-CA-38359

5 **PAUL JOHN MATAMOROS,**

6 Defendant-Appellant.

7 **APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF SAN JUAN COUNTY**

8 **Daylene A. Marsh, District Court Judge**

9 Raúl Torrez, Attorney General

10 Maris Veidemanis, Assistant Attorney General

11 Santa Fe, NM

12 for Appellee

13 Bennett J. Baur, Chief Public Defender

14 Nina Lalevic, Assistant Appellate Defender

15 Santa Fe, NM

16 for Appellant

17 **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

18 **HENDERSON, Judge.**

19 {1} Defendant Paul John Matamoros appeals the denial of his motion to suppress

20 evidence obtained from an inventory search of a vehicle he operated but did not own,

21 as well as a statement he made during his arrest. After his motion was denied,

22 Defendant pleaded no contest to trafficking by possession with intent to distribute,

23 contrary to NMSA 1978, Section 30-31-20 (2006), but reserved his right to appeal.

1 On appeal, Defendant raises two issues: (1) whether the decision to impound the
2 vehicle violated the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution or Article
3 II, Section 10 of the New Mexico Constitution; and (2) whether the arresting
4 deputy’s pre-*Miranda* questioning of Defendant violated his right to be free from
5 self-incrimination. For reasons that follow, we affirm.

6 **DISCUSSION**

7 **I. The Decision to Impound**

8 {2} Defendant does not challenge the scope of the inventory search of the vehicle.
9 Instead, he asserts the decision to impound the vehicle was unconstitutional absent
10 attempts to find reasonable alternatives. “The constitutionality of a search or seizure
11 is a mixed question of law and fact and demands de novo review.” *State v. Jim*, 2022-
12 NMCA-022, ¶ 7, 508 P.3d 937 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).
13 “When a defendant invokes our inherent power as a separate sovereign in our
14 federalist system of government to provide more liberty under the New Mexico
15 Constitution than is mandated by the United States Constitution, we utilize the
16 interstitial approach to constitutional interpretation set forth in *State v. Gomez*, 1997-
17 NMSC-006, ¶¶ 19, 22-23, 122 N.M. 777, 932 P.2d 1.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks
18 and citation omitted). Under this analysis, we “answer three questions: (1) whether
19 the right asserted by the defendant is protected under the federal constitution, (2)
20 whether the defendant preserved the state constitutional claim, and (3) whether there

1 exists any one of three reasons for diverging from federal precedent.” *Id.* Ultimately,
2 we disagree with Defendant because we conclude that the Fourth Amendment did
3 not prohibit the arresting deputy from impounding the vehicle, and Defendant failed
4 to develop his argument that the search of the vehicle was unlawful under the New
5 Mexico Constitution.

6 **A. The Fourth Amendment**

7 {3} The Fourth Amendment mandates that searches and seizures must be
8 reasonable. *State v. Weidner*, 2007-NMCA-063, ¶ 6, 141 N.M. 582, 158 P.3d 1025.
9 “Warrantless seizures are presumed to be unreasonable and the [s]tate bears the
10 burden of proving reasonableness.” *State v. Rowell*, 2008-NMSC-041, ¶ 10, 144
11 N.M. 371, 188 P.3d 95 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). In order to
12 prove that a warrantless search is reasonable, the state has the burden of showing the
13 search was justified by an exception to the warrant requirement. *See State v.*
14 *Baldonado*, 1992-NMCA-140, ¶ 19, 115 N.M. 106, 847 P.2d 751. Inventory
15 searches are a well-recognized exception to the Fourth Amendment’s warrant
16 requirement. *See Weidner*, 2007-NMCA-063, ¶ 6; *see also Jim*, 2022-NMCA-022,
17 ¶ 8 (“Nearly fifty years ago, the United States Supreme Court legitimized the
18 ‘routine practice of securing and inventorying’ the contents of an automobile after it
19 had been impounded.” (quoting *South Dakota v. Opperman*, 428 U.S. 364, 369
20 (1976))).

1 {4} Our Supreme Court has concluded that for the inventory search exception to
2 apply under the Fourth Amendment, “there must be *some* nexus between the arrest
3 and the reason for the impounding,” but “that nexus need only be reasonable.” *State*
4 *v. Williams*, 1982-NMSC-041, ¶ 6, 97 N.M. 634, 642 P.2d 1093. “[N]o compelling
5 need must be present to justify impoundment of a vehicle incident to an arrest.” *Id.*
6 If a defendant possesses property at the time of an arrest, “then a reasonable nexus
7 exist[s] between the arrest and the seizure and inventory search of the [property].”
8 *State v. Davis*, 2018-NMSC-001, ¶ 16, 408 P.3d 506. “[A] defendant ‘possesses’ any
9 object that the defendant loses control over as a consequence of arrest *and* where
10 that loss of control gives rise to the possibility that the object might be lost, stolen,
11 or destroyed and the police potentially held liable for the loss, theft, or destruction.”
12 *Id.* ¶ 18 (emphasis added).

13 {5} Here, there is a reasonable nexus between Defendant’s arrest and the reason
14 for impounding the vehicle. Defendant lost control of the vehicle because of his
15 arrest. Although Defendant had just parked the vehicle at a private residence, it was
16 not registered to Defendant, the passenger, or the persons residing at the private
17 residence. Without permission from the registered owner to leave the vehicle at a
18 private residence, leaving it would present a risk that the vehicle could have been
19 lost, stolen, or destroyed. *See id.*; *see also State v. Boswell*, 1991-NMSC-004, ¶¶ 2,
20 12-13, 111 N.M. 240, 804 P.2d 1059 (holding that there was a reasonable nexus

1 between the defendant’s arrest and seizure of his wallet for an inventory search when
2 he was arrested at a grocery store and his wallet was left there, even though the
3 defendant offered to have a friend pick it up). Accordingly, there was a reasonable
4 nexus between Defendant’s arrest and the reason for impounding the vehicle.

5 {6} Defendant urges us to conclude otherwise—that the vehicle was safe because
6 it was lawfully parked on private property. He asks us to adopt the analysis provided
7 by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in *United States v. Sanders*, 796 F.3d 1241
8 (10th Cir. 2015), which departs from other federal circuit courts, and to determine
9 that the decision to impound was a pretext for a drug search. *See id.* at 1249-50
10 (examining a non-exclusive list of factors to determine “whether an impoundment is
11 justified by a reasonable and legitimate, non-pretextual community-caretaking
12 rationale”). Defendant did not present this argument to the district court and thus
13 failed to preserve it. *See State v. Montoya*, 2015-NMSC-010, ¶ 45, 345 P.3d 1056
14 (“In order to preserve an issue for appeal, a defendant must make a timely objection
15 that specifically apprises the trial court of the nature of the claimed error and invokes
16 an intelligent ruling thereon.” (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)).
17 Further, Defendant’s argument invites us to construe the reasonable nexus
18 requirement as one which “must be read in the way the Tenth Circuit reads it.” That
19 is, there must be “a nexus between the car and the crime for which the suspect is
20 arrested.” We are bound by our Supreme Court’s precedent, which articulates the

1 extent of our analysis as to whether the decision to impound a vehicle is permissible
2 under the Fourth Amendment. *See State v. Manzanares*, 1983-NMSC-102, ¶ 3, 100
3 N.M. 621, 674 P.2d 511 (citing *Alexander v. Delgado*, 1973-NMSC-030, ¶ 9, 84
4 N.M. 717, 507 P.2d 778); *see also Dalton v. Santander Consumer USA, Inc.*, 2015-
5 NMCA-030, ¶ 30, 345 P.3d 1086 (“Appeals in this Court are governed by the
6 decisions of the New Mexico Supreme Court—including decisions involving federal
7 law”), *rev’d on other grounds*, 2016-NMSC-035, 385 P.3d 619. Defendant’s
8 proposed analysis, however, would contradict our Supreme Court’s conclusion in
9 *Williams* that a “compelling need” to impound is not required, and “[t]he fact that
10 the vehicle was legally parked and *could* have been left there does not make the
11 impoundment improper.” 1982-NMSC-041, ¶¶ 6-7. Consequently, we agree with
12 the district court that the Fourth Amendment did not require suppressing the
13 evidence from the inventory search of the vehicle.

14 **B. Article II, Section 10**

15 {7} The search Defendant complains of is not protected by the Fourth
16 Amendment, and so we next consider whether Defendant preserved review of the
17 issue under the New Mexico Constitution. *See Jim*, 2022-NMCA-022, ¶ 7; *see also*
18 *State v. Tapia*, 2018-NMSC-017, ¶ 12, 414 P.3d 332 (“Under the interstitial
19 approach . . . we ask first whether the right being asserted is protected under the

1 federal constitution. If it is, then the state constitutional claim is not reached.”
2 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted)).

3 {8} “It is well-established that Article II, Section 10 provides more protection
4 against unreasonable searches and seizures than the Fourth Amendment.” *State v.*
5 *Leyva*, 2011-NMSC-009, ¶ 51, 149 N.M. 435, 250 P.3d 861. Accordingly,
6 Defendant “need only ‘(1) assert the constitutional principle that provides the
7 protection sought under the New Mexico Constitution, and (2) show the factual basis
8 needed for the [district] court to rule on the issue’ in order to preserve his claim.”
9 *Jim*, 2022-NMCA-022, ¶ 12 (alterations omitted) (quoting *Gomez*, 1997-NMSC-
10 006, ¶ 22)). Here, Defendant asserted in his motion to suppress that the inventory
11 search violated Article II, Section 10 of the New Mexico Constitution and developed
12 the facts supporting his argument in the motion and at the suppression hearing. The
13 district court also denied the motion on Fourth Amendment and Article II, Section
14 10 grounds. We conclude that Defendant’s Article II, Section 10 claim was
15 preserved.

16 {9} Nonetheless, Defendant has not adequately developed an argument on appeal
17 concerning the third step in our interstitial approach—whether there is any one of
18 three reasons for diverging from federal precedent: “flawed federal analysis,
19 structural differences between state and federal government, or distinctive state
20 characteristics.” *Jim*, 2022-NMCA-022, ¶ 15 (quoting *State v. Cardenas-Alvarez*,

1 2011-NMSC-017, ¶ 14, 130 N.M. 386, 25 P.3d 225). Defendant continues to
2 advocate that we apply the Tenth Circuit’s analysis in *Sanders*, but fails to explain
3 why such an approach is called for under our state constitution using the interstitial
4 approach. Defendant’s argument otherwise consists of repeated assertions, some of
5 which are mere speculation, that the decision to impound the vehicle was
6 unreasonable. However, those assertions are untethered to any standard for us to
7 determine whether it was so.

8 {10} Defendant’s generalized statements that Article II, Section 10 provides greater
9 protections against automobile searches alone do not establish that, in this case, the
10 decision to impound the vehicle was unconstitutional. For instance, Defendant points
11 us to *State v. Bramlett* to support his contention that the arresting deputy should have
12 left the vehicle since it was lawfully parked on private property, or at least contacted
13 its owner to retrieve it. 1980-NMCA-042, 94 N.M. 263, 609 P.2d 345, *overruled on*
14 *other grounds by Armijo v. State ex rel. Transp. Dep’t*, 1987-NMCA-052, ¶ 8, 105
15 N.M. 771, 737 P.2d 552. *Bramlett* is inapposite. *Bramlett* dealt with the scope of an
16 inventory search, where we concluded that the search was investigatory due to the
17 “intensity of the search” combined with the fact that the vehicle was left alone for
18 two hours after the defendant’s arrest. *Id.* ¶¶ 12, 16. Here, Defendant does not
19 complain about the “intensity of the search” nor the time that passed before the
20 vehicle was inventoried. While we intimated in *Bramlett* that contacting the

1 defendant’s father, who was the vehicle’s registered owner, “obviated the necessity
2 for an ‘inventory search,’” we did not conclude that contacting a third party to pick
3 up their vehicle is a constitutional requirement before impounding. *See id.* ¶ 16.
4 Defendant has not adequately developed an argument that such a requirement now
5 exists.

6 {11} Defendant also attempts to extrapolate from *Jim* that Article II, Section 10
7 requires the arresting deputy to either leave the vehicle with people who did not own
8 it or call and wait for its owner to retrieve it. However, *Jim* addressed the scope of
9 an automobile search—in that case, the parties did not contest the arresting officer’s
10 authority to impound the vehicle. 2022-NMCA-022, ¶¶ 13-14. Moreover, Defendant
11 offers no explanation for why the additional protections under Article II, Section 10,
12 as described in *Jim*, should be extended further to protect against the deputy’s
13 decision to impound the vehicle in this case.

14 {12} Given the deficiencies above, we decline Defendant’s invitation to consider
15 whether our analysis under Article II, Section 10 should diverge from federal law.
16 “There is a presumption of correctness in the district court’s rulings. Accordingly, it
17 is [the d]efendant’s burden on appeal to demonstrate any claimed error below.” *State*
18 *v. Aragon*, 1999-NMCA-060, ¶ 10, 127 N.M. 393, 981 P.2d 1211 (alterations,
19 internal quotation marks, and citations omitted). Defendant having failed to provide
20 us with a fully developed argument supporting the reasons for departing from federal

1 law, we presume the district court correctly concluded that the evidence from the
2 inventory search should not have been suppressed pursuant to Article II, Section 10.

3 **C. Statement Made During Arrest**

4 {13} We next address whether Defendant’s statement that he had syringes and a
5 sharps container in his pocket should have been suppressed. Specifically, Defendant
6 argues that his response to the deputy’s question, “Do you have anything that is
7 going to stick me, poke me, [or] hurt me?” should have been suppressed because
8 Defendant was not advised of his rights under *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436
9 (1966). The district court found that Defendant’s right to be free from self-
10 incrimination was not violated because Defendant was not being interrogated.
11 Rather, the district court determined that the deputy’s question “was designed to
12 protect the officer, not elicit incriminating information.”

13 {14} “Whether facts support an exception to the *Miranda* requirement is a question
14 of law” we review de novo. *State v. Widmer*, 2020-NMSC-007, ¶ 11, 461 P.3d 881
15 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “The federal and state constitutional
16 provisions protect against self-incrimination and require, at a minimum, that before
17 any individual may be subjected to custodial interrogation, the individual must be
18 made aware of various rights the courts have established to aid in protecting the right
19 to be free from self-incrimination.” *Id.* ¶ 12 (alteration, internal quotation marks, and
20 citation omitted). “Interrogation occurs when an officer subjects an individual to

1 questioning or circumstances which the officer knows or should know are
2 reasonably likely to elicit incriminating responses.” *Id.* ¶ 23 (internal quotation
3 marks and citation omitted).

4 {15} At the outset, we disagree with the district court that Defendant was not under
5 interrogation. We see little distinction between the deputy’s question here and the
6 question elicited in *Widmer*—where our Supreme Court determined the question, “Is
7 there anything on your person that I should know about,” subjected the defendant to
8 custodial interrogation. *Id.* ¶¶ 16, 34. The parties do not dispute that Defendant was
9 in custody when he was questioned, or that the deputy knew or should know that the
10 question was reasonably likely to elicit an incriminating response. And like the
11 question in *Widmer*, the deputy’s question here was not typically attendant to arrest
12 and custody, even if the deputy testified that he routinely asks it. *See id.* ¶ 21 (“An
13 officer is not permitted to transform a question that constitutes interrogation into a
14 question normally attendant to arrest and custody by simply making it a policy to
15 ask specific questions during the process of custody or arrest.”). Accordingly,
16 Defendant should have been given a warning under *Miranda*.

17 {16} However, we agree with the State that the deputy’s question was subject to
18 the public safety exception expressed in *New York v. Quarles*, 467 U.S. 649, 655-56
19 (1984). *See Widmer*, 2020-NMSC-007, ¶¶ 3, 35 (concluding that the *Quarles*
20 exception applied “because the question was not asked solely to elicit incriminating


1 testimony”). “*Quarles* applies in a situation where the potential threat is to an
2 officer’s safety.” *Id.* ¶ 37. Threats to officer safety encompass “concerns about
3 weapons a suspect could use against an officer during a search,” which include
4 “sharp and bio-hazardous objects.” *Id.* ¶ 38 (internal quotation marks and citation
5 omitted). At the suppression hearing, the deputy testified that his question, “Do you
6 have anything that is going to stick me, poke me [or] hurt me, anything of that
7 nature?” was asked in the interest of officer safety, such as preventing infection of
8 blood-borne pathogens. The deputy asked no other questions before Defendant
9 responded. Similar to the officer in *Widmer*, the deputy here “limited the inquiry to
10 items on Defendant’s person including potentially hazardous items that could affect
11 officer safety.” *Id.* ¶ 39. Thus, the deputy’s question was not “solely to elicit
12 incriminating testimony.” *Id.* ¶ 35.

13 {17} Defendant argues that *Widmer* is distinguishable because “there was no
14 indication that [Defendant] was dangerous.” However, whether an officer believes
15 an arrestee to be dangerous is irrelevant to the analysis in *Widmer*. Our Supreme
16 Court cautioned against such a “narrow” reading. *Id.* ¶ 40. Given the similarities
17 between the facts here and those in *Widmer*, we conclude that the public safety
18 exception to *Miranda* applied. Thus, the district court did not err in ruling that the
19 statement need not be suppressed.

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 {18} For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the district court's denial of Defendant's
3 motion to suppress.

4 {19} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 
6 _____
SHAMMARA H. HENDERSON, Judge

7 **WE CONCUR:**

8 
9 _____
JENNIFER L. ATTREP, Chief Judge

10 
11 _____
GERALD E. BACA, Judge