

NO. 12-11-00248-CV

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

**RAUL TREVINO,
APPELLANT**

§

APPEAL FROM THE 349TH

V.

**NATRENIA L. HICKS, GWENDOLYN
SPURLOCK, JOHN DOE SWEETIN,
GREGORY OLIVER, DEBBIE ERWIN,
CHERYL LAWSON, V. BARROW,
FRANK HOLST, W. R. GUNNELLS,
JOHN DOE, DIRECTOR, TEXAS
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL
JUSTICE AND THE STATE OF TEXAS,
APPELLEES**

§

JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

§

HOUSTON COUNTY, TEXAS

**MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM**

This appeal is being dismissed for want of prosecution. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(b). Appellant, Raul Trevino, perfected his appeal on August 11, 2011. The clerk's record was filed on October 11, 2011, making Appellant's brief due on or before December 12, 2011. Appellant filed two motions for extension of time to file his brief. Both motions were granted, making Appellant's brief due on February 8, 2012. Appellant was notified on January 4, 2012, that no further extensions would be granted and that failure to file his brief by the extended deadline would result in the case being presented to the court for dismissal. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.8.

The February 8, 2012 deadline for filing Appellant's brief has passed, and Appellant has not filed a brief. Accordingly, we *dismiss* the appeal *for want of prosecution*. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.8(a)(1), 42.3.(b).

Opinion delivered February 29, 2012.

Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.

(PUBLISH)



**COURT OF APPEALS
TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS
JUDGMENT**

FEBRUARY 29, 2012

NO. 12-11-00248-CV

RAUL TREVINO,

Appellant

V.

NATRENIA L. HICKS, GWENDOLYN SPURLOCK, JOHN DOE SWEETIN,

GREGORY OLIVER, DEBBIE ERWIN, CHERYL LAWSON, V. BARROW,

GRANK HOLST, W. R. GUNNELLS, JOHN DOE, DIRECTOR,

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

AND THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellees

Appeal from the 349th Judicial District Court
of Houston County, Texas. (Tr.Ct.No. 11-0018)

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record; and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this court that this appeal should be dismissed for want of prosecution.

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED by this court that this appeal be, and the same is, hereby **dismissed for want of prosecution**; and that this decision be certified to the court below for observance.

By per curiam opinion.

Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.