

Opinion issued September 8, 2016



In The
Court of Appeals
For The
First District of Texas

NO. 01-16-00578-CR

IN RE SAMUEL ROY JACKSON, Relator

Original Proceeding on Petition for Writ of Mandamus

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Relator, Samuel Roy Jackson, incarcerated and proceeding pro se, has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus, “seeking relief from [a] void court order” rendered in the underlying proceeding.¹ We dismiss the petition for want of jurisdiction.

¹ The underlying case is *The State of Texas v. Samuel Roy Jackson*, cause number 913043, pending in the 183rd District Court of Harris County, Texas, the Honorable Vanessa Velasquez presiding.

Relator seeks relief from a final felony conviction. *See Jackson v. State*, No. 01–04–01137–CR, 2005 WL 3072018, at *4 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Nov. 17, 2005, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication) (affirming conviction). Because his petition involves a final post-conviction felony proceeding, article 11.07 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure governs and provides the exclusive means to challenge the conviction. *See* TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. art. 11.07 (Vernon 2015); *Padieu v. Court of Appeals of Tex., Fifth Dist.*, 392 S.W.3d 115, 117 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013); *Bd. of Pardons & Paroles ex rel. Keene v. Court of Appeals for Eighth Dist.*, 910 S.W.2d 481, 482 (Tex. Crim. App. 1995). Only the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has jurisdiction in final post-conviction felony proceedings. *See In re Briscoe*, 230 S.W.3d 196, 196–97 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2006, orig. proceeding); *In re McAfee*, 53 S.W.3d 715, 717–18 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2001, orig. proceeding). “Article 11.07 contains no role for the courts of appeals.” *In re Briscoe*, 230 S.W.3d at 196. Accordingly, we do not have jurisdiction over relator’s mandamus petition.

We dismiss the petition for want of jurisdiction.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Justices Jennings, Keyes, and Brown.

Do not publish. TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b).