

J-S58026-12

J-S58027-12

**NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT I.O.P. 65.37**

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Appellee

v.

HUBERT JACKSON

Appellant

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

No. 514 WDA 2012

Appeal from the Judgment of Sentence of May 5, 1989  
In the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County  
Criminal Division at No(s): CP-02-CR-0008196-1988

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Appellee

v.

HUBERT JACKSON

Appellant

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

No. 515 WDA 2012

Appeal from the Judgment of Sentence of October 18, 1989  
In the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County  
Criminal Division at No(s): CP-02-CR-0010278-1988

BEFORE: GANTMAN, J., WECHT, J., and FITZGERALD, J.\*

JUDGMENT ORDER PER CURIAM

Filed: February 11, 2013

In two separately docketed notices of appeal,<sup>1</sup> Hubert Jackson ("Appellant") purports to file direct appeals of two judgments of sentence

---

\* Former Justice specially assigned to the Superior Court.

entered in quick succession over twenty years ago. At CP-02-CR-0008196-1988, Appellant's judgment of sentence was entered on May 5, 1989. Appellant filed a direct appeal, and this Court affirmed Appellant's judgment of sentence on July 13, 1990. ***See Commonwealth v. Jackson***, No. 1415 Pittsburgh 1989 (Pa. Super. 1990) (unpublished).

At CP-02-CR-0010278-1988, following a plea of *nolo contendere*, Appellant's judgment of sentence was entered on October 18, 1989. Accordingly, Appellant had until November 17, 1989, to file a direct appeal. No appeal was taken from this judgment of sentence, rendering his judgment of sentence final on or about that date.

These appeals follow numerous petitions under the Post-Conviction Relief Act, 42 Pa.C.S. §§ 9541, *et seq.*, and other facially infirm, untimely filings, collectively numbering in the dozens, that have required the unnecessary expenditure of considerable judicial resources in both the court of common pleas and this Court. Trial Court Opinion, 5/15/2012, at 2-3. As aptly stated by the trial court, these notices of appeal are "grossly untimely." ***Id.*** at 4; ***see*** Pa.R.A.P. 903(a) ("Except as otherwise prescribed by this rule, the notice of appeal required by Rule 902 (manner of taking appeal) shall be filed within 30 days after entry of the order from which the appeal is

(Footnote Continued) \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> Because these two appeals concern the same judgment of sentence and raise materially identical arguments, and because of the nature of our disposition of both appeals herein, we consolidate these cases for disposition.

taken."); ***Commonwealth v. Green***, 862 A.2d 613, 615, 621 (Pa. Super. 2004) (*en banc*) (holding that only a timely appeal establishes this Court's jurisdiction to hear an appeal, and quashing the appeal due to its tardiness). Given the untimeliness of Appellant's notices of appeal, we have no jurisdiction to entertain either appeal.<sup>2</sup>

Appeals quashed.

---

<sup>2</sup> For the same reason, we must quash Appellant's Petition to Object to Subject-Matter Jurisdiction, filed at both 514 and 515 WDA 2012.