



New Mexico Law Review

34 N.M. L. Rev. ix (Summer 2004 2004)

Summer 2004

Introduction

New Mexico Law Review

Recommended Citation

New Mexico Law Review, *Introduction*, 34 N.M. L. Rev. ix (2004).
Available at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmlr/vol34/iss3/2>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by The University of New Mexico School of Law. For more information, please visit the *New Mexico Law Review* website: www.lawschool.unm.edu/nmlr

INTRODUCTION

The *New Mexico Law Review* is pleased to present the final issue of Volume 34. Each year the *Law Review* reserves its final issue to showcase the work of selected *Law Review* members. More than any other, this issue represents the *Law Review's* dedication to providing articles that are relevant and practical for the New Mexico Bench and Bar. This year the *Law Review* is proud to offer a wide variety of articles focusing on various aspects of the law in New Mexico.

Quinn Bumgarner-Kirby's article, *The Continuing Debate Over Tort Duty in New Mexico: The Role of Foreseeability and Policy in Herrera v. Quality Pontiac*, and Flynn Sylvest's article, *New Tort Rules for Unmarried Partners: The Potential for Successful Loss of Consortium and NIED Claims by Same-Sex Partners in New Mexico after Lozoya v. Sanchez*, both touch on recent changes in New Mexico tort law. Quinn Bumgarner-Kirby's article focuses on the expanding definition of duty in third-party tortfeasor cases, while Flynn Sylvest's article concentrates on the extension of loss of consortium to a non-married couple and the possible extension of *Lozoya* to same-sex couples and other areas of tort law. Kimberly Bannerman's article, *State ex rel. New Mexico Judicial Standards Commission v. Espinosa: Can Judicial Integrity Survive Executive Control?*, concentrates on the governor's removal of lay members from the Judicial Standards Commission and how the New Mexico Supreme Court's decision in *Espinosa* threatens the balance of power between the branches of government in New Mexico.

Amanda Sanchez's article, *State v. Urioste: A Prosecutor's Dream and Defender's Nightmare*, discusses New Mexico's standard for determining reasonable suspicion based upon an anonymous tip and argues that New Mexico precedent suggests a different standard than that applied in *Urioste*. Cara Mickelsen's article, *Adding Charges on Retrial: Double Jeopardy, Interstitialism, and State v. Lynch*, and Michelle Haubert-Barela's article, *Complying with Nunez: The Necessary Procedure for Obtaining Forfeiture of Property and Avoiding Double Jeopardy after State v. Esparza*, both focus on double jeopardy in New Mexico. Cara Mickelsen's article deals with the ability of prosecutors to add additional charges on retrial after a defendant wins a new trial on appeal in light of the New Mexico double jeopardy clause, while Michelle Haubert-Barela's article focuses on the necessary procedure for pursuing civil forfeiture in connection with a criminal prosecution.

We hope you enjoy the final issue of Volume 34!