

Corrections to this opinion/decision not affecting the outcome, at the Court's discretion, can occur up to the time of publication with NM Compilation Commission. The Court will ensure that the electronic version of this opinion/decision is updated accordingly in Odyssey.

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

2 **STATE OF NEW MEXICO,**

3 Plaintiff-Appellee,

4 v.

5 **TERRANCE DIXON,**

6 Defendant-Appellant.

Court of Appeals of New Mexico

Filed 2/24/2025 7:26 AM



Ramon J. Maestas
Chief Clerk

No. A-1-CA-42225

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

8 **Stephen Wayne, District Court Judge**

9 Raúl Torrez, Attorney General

10 Santa Fe, NM

11 for Appellee

12 Bennett J. Baur, Chief Public Defender

13 Kathleen T. Baldrige, Assistant Appellate Defender

14 Santa Fe, NM

15 for Appellant

16 **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

17 **HANISEE, Judge.**

18 {1} This matter was submitted to this Court on the brief in chief pursuant to the

19 Administrative Order for Appeals in Criminal Cases from the Second, Eleventh, and

20 Twelfth Judicial District Courts in *In re Pilot Project for Criminal Appeals*, No.

21 2022-002, effective November 1, 2022. Having considered the brief in chief,

22 concluding the briefing submitted to this Court provides no possibility for reversal,

1 and determining that this case is appropriate for resolution on Track 1 as defined in
2 that order, we affirm for the following reasons.

3 {2} Defendant appeals from the district court’s order revoking his probation in
4 three cases that were consolidated below for purposes of sentencing. [BIC 1]
5 Specifically, Defendant argues that there was insufficient evidence establishing that
6 he willfully violated his probation by failing to report in light of the fact that he was
7 homeless and had limited means of communication and transportation. [BIC 6-9]

8 {3} Proof of a probation violation “must be established with a reasonable
9 certainty, such that a reasonable and impartial mind would believe that the defendant
10 violated the terms of probation.” *State v. Green*, 2015-NMCA-007, ¶ 22,
11 341 P.3d 10. The violation must entail “willful conduct on the part of the
12 probationer” in order to be sufficient grounds for revocation. *State v. Bruno R.*, 2003-
13 NMCA-057, ¶ 11, 133 N.M. 566, 66 P.3d 339. When a “violation of probation is not
14 willful, but resulted from factors beyond a probationer’s control, probation may not
15 be revoked.” *Id.* ¶ 13. “The burden of proving a violation with reasonable certainty
16 lies with the [s]tate.” *Green*, 2015-NMCA-007, ¶ 22. However, “[o]nce the state
17 offers proof of a breach of a material condition of probation, the defendant must
18 come forward with evidence to excuse non-compliance.” *State v. Leon*, 2013-
19 NMCA-011, ¶ 36, 292 P.3d 493 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).


1 {4} “We review [the] district court’s decision to revoke probation under an abuse
2 of discretion standard. To establish an abuse of discretion, it must appear the district
3 court acted unfairly or arbitrarily, or committed manifest error.” *Green*, 2015-
4 NMCA-007, ¶ 22 (alterations, internal quotation marks, and citation omitted).
5 Moreover, we “view[] the evidence in a light most favorable to the [s]tate and
6 indulg[e] all reasonable inferences in favor of the [district] court’s judgment.” *State*
7 *v. Erickson K.*, 2002-NMCA-058, ¶ 21, 132 N.M. 258, 46 P.3d 1258.

8 {5} The district court found that Defendant violated the terms of his probation by
9 failing to report to his probation officer as required as a standard condition of his
10 probation. [BIC 5] The evidence presented at the revocation hearing established that
11 Defendant never reported for probation, including failing to report for even his initial
12 intake. [BIC 2] Probation officers attempted to contact Defendant and pay him a
13 field visit, but Defendant was not at his listed address. [BIC 2] Defendant testified
14 that he failed to report to probation because he was homeless and without a cell
15 phone after being released from jail. [BIC 3-4] Defendant also testified that he
16 attempted to find the probation office, but was unable to because the office changed
17 location. [BIC 8] However, Defendant admitted that he never requested a phone at
18 the local churches he frequented, nor did he use the public access phones and
19 computers at the library to contact probation, despite knowing that he was required
20 to report to probation. [BIC 4]

1 {6} The district court concluded Defendant’s failure to report and failure to make
2 additional attempts to contact probation sufficient to find Defendant willfully
3 violated the terms of his probation. [BIC 5-6] *See State v. Motes*, 1994-NMSC-115,
4 ¶ 11, 118 N.M. 727, 885 P.2d 648 (stating that, because intent is subjective, it is
5 rarely proved by direct evidence and is almost always inferred from other facts in
6 the case). Viewing this evidence in the light most favorable to the district court’s
7 decision, *Erickson K.*, 2002-NMCA-058, ¶ 21, we cannot say the district court
8 abused its discretion in concluding that Defendant’s explanation was insufficient to
9 “to excuse non[]compliance.” *Leon*, 2013-NMCA-011, ¶ 36. We therefore conclude
10 that Defendant’s probation revocation is supported by sufficient evidence of
11 willfulness.

12 {7} Based on the foregoing, we affirm the revocation of Defendant’s probation.

13 {8} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 
15 _____
J. MILES HANISEE, Judge

16 **WE CONCUR:**

17 
18 _____
SHAMMARA H. HENDERSON, Judge

19 
20 _____
GERALD E. BACA, Judge