



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

**NO. 02-17-00222-CR
NO. 02-17-00223-CR**

GALE C. HUTCHINSON

APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

STATE

FROM THE 372ND DISTRICT COURT OF TARRANT COUNTY
TRIAL COURT NOS. 1450346D, 1450350D

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

Appellant Gale C. Hutchinson filed a pro se notice of appeal stating his intent to appeal from the trial court's ruling holding his pretrial bond insufficient and denying him bond. On July 18, 2017, we notified Hutchinson and his appointed counsel of our concern that we lack jurisdiction over these appeals because the trial court has not entered any appealable orders. *See McKown v.*

¹See Tex. R. App. P. 47.4.

State, 915 S.W.2d 160, 161 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1996, no pet.) (noting that we generally have jurisdiction to consider an appeal in a criminal case only when there has been a judgment of conviction). We stated that unless Hutchinson or any party desiring to continue these appeals filed on or before Friday, July 28, 2017, a response showing grounds for continuing them, we would dismiss both appeals for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(f), 44.3. Hutchinson’s appointed counsel did not file a response. Hutchinson filed a pro se response, but it does not show grounds for continuing these appeals.

Hutchinson has not provided us with a written order signed by the trial court holding his pretrial bond insufficient or denying him bond. See Tex. R. App. P. 26.2(a)(1); *Jarvis v. State*, No. 02-15-00410-CR, 2016 WL 741972, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Feb. 25, 2016, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication) (noting that to perfect an appeal of an appealable order in a criminal case, a notice of appeal must be filed after the trial court signs a written order). But even if he had, we lack jurisdiction to review interlocutory orders holding a defendant’s bond insufficient or denying him bail. See *Ragston v. State*, 424 S.W.3d 49, 52 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014) (holding courts of appeals lack jurisdiction to review interlocutory orders regarding excessive bail or the denial of bail); see also *Chestang v. State*, Nos. 12-16-00305-CR, 12-16-00306-CR, 2017 WL 104637, at *1 (Tex. App.—Tyler Jan. 11, 2017, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication) (holding court lacked jurisdiction over interlocutory order granting the State’s motion to find defendant’s bond insufficient); *Lenard v.*

State, No. 05-14-00767-CR, 2014 WL 4536538, at *1 (Tex. App.—Dallas Sept. 12, 2014, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication) (holding court lacked jurisdiction over interlocutory order holding defendant’s bond insufficient and raising the bond). Accordingly, we dismiss these appeals for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(f).

PER CURIAM

PANEL: GABRIEL, SUDDERTH, and KERR, JJ.

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

DELIVERED: August 17, 2017