



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

No. 02-19-00119-CR

CASEY JOE COCHNAUER, Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

On Appeal from the 78th District Court
Wichita County, Texas
Trial Court No. 60089-B

Before Sudderth, C.J.; Gabriel and Kerr, JJ.
Per Curiam Memorandum Opinion

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant Casey Joe Cochnauer was indicted with one count of indecency with a child by sexual contact and one count of indecency with a child by exposure. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 21.11(a)(1), (2)(A). Appellant now attempts to appeal certain pretrial rulings by the trial court. In particular, Appellant attempts to appeal the trial court's rulings on his motion to dismiss the indictment, motion to interview all of the victims and witnesses prior to trial, and motion to "formally object" to the State's intent to offer evidence of Appellant's prior convictions. The trial court denied the first two motions. The trial court has not ruled on the third motion.¹

We generally do not have jurisdiction to consider an appeal in a criminal case unless a judgment of conviction has been rendered. *See McKown v. State*, 915 S.W.2d 160, 161 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1996, no pet.) (per curiam). We do not have jurisdiction to review interlocutory orders unless that jurisdiction has been expressly granted by law. *See Apolinar v. State*, 820 S.W.2d 792, 794 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); *see also Williams v. State*, 464 S.W.2d 842, 844 (Tex. Crim. App. 1971) (noting that an order on a motion to dismiss an indictment is only reviewable on appeal after conviction).

By letter dated March 28, 2019, we informed Appellant of our concern that we may lack jurisdiction over this appeal because the trial court has not entered any

¹Appellant did not provide an order granting or denying his motion regarding the State's intent to use evidence of prior convictions. We have contacted the trial court clerk and as of April 24, 2019, the trial court had not ruled upon the motion.

appealable orders and we requested a response showing grounds for continuing the appeal. Appellant has filed a response, but it does not provide grounds for our jurisdiction to consider his appeal. We therefore dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(f); 44.3.

Per Curiam

Do Not Publish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

Delivered: May 16, 2019