

NO. 12-12-00420-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

***WILLIE RAY,
APPELLANT***

§

APPEAL FROM THE 7TH

V.

§

JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

***THE STATE OF TEXAS,
APPELLEE***

§

SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Appellant Willie Ray attempts to appeal an order denying his petition for reformation of judgment, which we construe as a motion for judgment nunc pro tunc.

The denial of a motion for judgment nunc pro tunc is not an appealable order. *See Everett v. State*, 82 S.W.3d 735, 735 (Tex. App.—Waco 2002, pet. dism'd). Accordingly, on December 12, 2012, this court notified Appellant, pursuant to Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 37.2, that the information received in this appeal does not contain a final judgment or other appealable order. Appellant was further informed that the appeal would be dismissed if the information received in the appeal was not amended on or before January 11, 2013, to show the jurisdiction of this court.

The January 11, 2013 deadline has passed, and Appellant has not shown the jurisdiction of this court or otherwise responded to its December 12, 2012 notice. Accordingly, the appeal is ***dismissed for want of jurisdiction***. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 37.2, 42.3.

Opinion delivered January 23, 2013.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



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

JANUARY 23, 2013

NO. 12-12-00420-CR

WILLIE RAY,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 7th Judicial District Court
of Smith County, Texas. (Tr.Ct.No. 007-0396-03)

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record; and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this court that this court is without jurisdiction of the appeal, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED by this court that this appeal be, and the same is, hereby **dismissed for want of jurisdiction**; 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.