

LFC Requester:	
-----------------------	--

**AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS
2026 REGULAR SESSION**

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, UPLOAD ANALYSIS TO:

AgencyAnalysis.nmlegis.gov

{Analysis must be uploaded as a PDF}

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

{Indicate if analysis is on an original bill, amendment, substitute or a correction of a previous bill}

Check all that apply:

Original **Amendment**
Correction **Substitute**

Date Feb. 6, 2026
Bill No: SB 250-280

Sponsor: Antonio Maestas
Short Title: Ignition Interlock for Revoked License

Agency Name and Code LOPD-280
Number: _____
Person Writing Kim Chavez Cook
Phone: 505.395.2822 **Email** Kim.ChavezCook@lcpdm.us

SECTION II: FISCAL IMPACT

APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY26	FY27		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

REVENUE (dollars in thousands)

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY26	FY27	FY28		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY26	FY27	FY28	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
Total						

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to:
Duplicates/Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act

SECTION III: NARRATIVE

BILL SUMMARY

Synopsis: SB 250 would change the collateral consequences to a conviction for driving on a revoked license. The bill would replace the 30-day immobilization of the driver’s car and one-year bar on issuing any form of driver’s license with the substitute requirements that the driver (1) install an ignition interlock device on the vehicle, and (2) obtain a interlock driver’s license upon conviction for driving on a revoked license.

SB 250 would also amend the metropolitan court statute, NMSA 1978, § 34-8A-6, to make the metropolitan court a “court of record” in criminal actions involving driving on a revoked license, in addition to existing cases involving DWI or domestic violence, thus attaching a right of appeal to the court of appeals. (For all other types of cases, the metropolitan court is not a court of record and appeals are taken de novo to the district court.)

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Transforming non-record proceedings into on-record proceedings in metropolitan court does not necessarily create a fiscal impact on LOPD, as the work required to defend against driving while revoked would remain unchanged. However, an increase in direct appeals to the Court of Appeals could impact LOPD caseloads in the Appellate Division.

Meanwhile, while some defendants may prefer an interlock license than a total lack of license, the costs of interlock devices and limitations of an interlock license may dissuade others from a plea agreement. It is difficult to predict the number of cases of this sort that would be appealed in any given year. Barring some other way to reduce indigent defense workload, any increase in the number of on-record appeals would bring a concomitant need for an increase in indigent defense funding. Of course accurate prediction of the fiscal impact would be impossible to speculate; assessment of the required resources would be necessary after the implementation of the proposed statutory scheme.

Any increased demand for ignition interlock devices could impact the interlock device fund for leasing such devices to indigent people required to install them. The bill would benefit from a recurring appropriation to that fund equal to the costs in interlock devices based on the number of driving while revoked convictions in the metropolitan court each year.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

Currently, an interlock driver's license and ignition interlock device is required following a DWI conviction to ensure the driver cannot drive without such a device, thus ensuring they are sober while driving for a set period of time. The rationale supports public safety and driver rehabilitation.

Analyst notes that – if revocation was because of DWI – the interlock license and device would already have been required based on an underlying DWI conviction, so that any such requirement would seem redundant of the already-existing order attached to the DWI. However, if the driver failed to comply initially and incurred a driving while revoked conviction as a result, the bill would provide a path to compliance with a modified license rather than an automatic loss of driving privileges.

Although a driver's license may be revoked for DWI, it is not the only possible basis for revocation. To tie the alcohol-detection function of the interlock, Analyst recommends limiting the interlock requirement to defendants whose underlying revocation was the result of DWI, and providing the alternative of a 30-day immobilization for non-DWI revocations.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

TECHNICAL ISSUES

Analyst is unaware whether this legislation is germane under Art. IV, Section 5. It is not a budget bill and analyst is unaware that it has been drawn pursuant to a special message of the Governor.

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

ALTERNATIVES

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

AMENDMENTS