



**In the
Court of Appeals
Second Appellate District of Texas
at Fort Worth**

No. 02-18-00455-CR

No. 02-18-00456-CR

QUINLON DAJUAN JENKINS, APPELLANT

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

On Appeal from the 89th District Court
Wichita County, Texas
Trial Court Nos. 56039-C, 55833-C

Before Gabriel, Kerr, and Pittman, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Gabriel

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pro se appellant Quinlon Dajuan Jenkins attempts to appeal the trial court's orders denying his Motion for Indigency and his Motion for Discovery and Deposition. On October 23, 2018, we sent Jenkins a letter expressing our concern that we lack jurisdiction over his appeals because the trial court had not entered any appealable orders and had not signed a judgment of conviction. We instructed him that unless he filed a response showing grounds for continuing the appeals, we could dismiss them. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 44.3. Jenkins responded to our request, but his responses do not show grounds for continuing the appeals.

In a criminal case, we generally have jurisdiction only when the trial court has signed a judgment of conviction. *McKown v. State*, 915 S.W.2d 160, 161 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1996, no pet.). “We do not have jurisdiction to review interlocutory orders unless that jurisdiction has been expressly granted to us by law.” *Id.* Neither of the rulings of which Jenkins complains is a final judgment of conviction or an appealable interlocutory order. Therefore, we dismiss these appeals for want of jurisdiction. Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(f); *McKown*, 915 S.W.2d at 161.

/s/ Lee Gabriel

Lee Gabriel
Justice

Do Not Publish
Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b)

Delivered: November 21, 2018