



**COURT OF APPEALS  
SECOND DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH**

**NO. 02-12-00290-CR**

**NO. 02-12-00291-CR**

TOMMY SHAE CARGILL

APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

STATE

-----

FROM CRIMINAL DISTRICT COURT NO. 4 OF TARRANT COUNTY

-----

**MEMORANDUM OPINION<sup>1</sup>**

-----

Appellant Tommy Shae Cargill attempts to appeal from his convictions for aggravated robbery and felony driving while intoxicated. The trial court's certifications of Appellant's right to appeal state in each case that this "is a plea-bargain case, and the defendant has NO right of appeal" and that "the defendant has waived the right of appeal." See Tex. R. App. P. 25.2(a)(2). On June 29,

---

<sup>1</sup>See Tex. R. App. P. 47.4.

2012, we notified Appellant that these appeals could be dismissed unless he or any party desiring to continue the appeals filed a response showing grounds for continuing the appeals. Appellant filed a pro se response that does not present grounds for continuing the appeals.

The Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure are clear that in a plea-bargain case, an appellant may appeal only those matters that were raised by written motion filed and ruled on before trial or after getting the trial court's permission to appeal. See Tex. R. App. P. 25.2(a)(2). Because the trial court's certifications reflect that Appellant has no right of appeal, we dismiss these appeals for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 25.2(a)(2), (d), 43.2(f).

PER CURIAM

PANEL: GARDNER, WALKER, and MCCOY, JJ.

DO NOT PUBLISH  
Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b)

DELIVERED: August 2, 2012