

appeal a trial judge's decision to grant or deny probation.” *Id.* See also *State v. Mahurin*, 207 S.W.3d 662, 662-63 (Mo.App. 2006); *State v. Carrillo*, 935 S.W.2d 328, 329 & n.1 (Mo.App. 1996).

Defendant’s effort to distinguish this precedent² is not persuasive, partly because it cites cases that were not direct appeals, but the type of writ actions that *Williams* called “sufficient” remedies in this situation. See 871 S.W.2d at 452 n.2. Whatever such cases³ hold on the merits, they do not support a direct appeal here or undermine *Williams* on that issue.

Lacking authority to proceed, we dismiss this appeal.

Daniel E. Scott, Chief Judge

Rahmeyer, P.J., and Bates, J., concur

Filed: August 17, 2010

Appellant’s attorney: N. Scott Rosenblum, Eric Selig, Erin R. Griebel

Respondent’s attorney: Chris Koster, Daniel N. McPherson

² These points wholly disregard Rule 84.04(d)(1)(A) and arguably preserve nothing for review, but we have exercised our discretion not to dismiss on that basis.

³ Defendant principally cites two mandamus cases: *State ex rel. Mertens v. Brown*, 198 S.W.3d 616, 619 (Mo. banc 2006) and *State ex rel. Dane v. State*, 115 S.W.3d 876, 879 (Mo.App. 2003).