



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

No. 02-20-00141-CR

WILLIAM BOYD PIERCE, Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

On Appeal from the 211th District Court
Denton County, Texas
Trial Court No. F-2003-0377-C

Before Sudderth, C.J.; Gabriel and Kerr, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Chief Justice Sudderth

MEMORANDUM OPINION

We notified pro se appellant William Boyd Pierce of our concern that we lacked jurisdiction over his appeal because the trial court's order denying his motion for nunc pro tunc judgment did not appear to be an appealable order. *See Ex parte Florence*, 319 S.W.3d 695, 696 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010) (providing that the appropriate remedy for denial of a motion for judgment nunc pro tunc is to file an application for writ of mandamus in a court of appeals). We informed Pierce that unless he or any party desiring to continue the appeal filed a response showing grounds for continuing the appeal by November 13, 2020, the appeal could be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(f), 44.3.

Because no response showing grounds for continuing the appeal has been filed, we dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(f); *Caldwell v. State*, No. 02-20-00142-CR, 2020 WL 6498519, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Nov. 5, 2020, no pet. h.) (per curiam) (mem. op., not designated for publication) (“An order denying a motion for judgment nunc pro tunc is not appealable.”).

/s/ Bonnie Sudderth
Bonnie Sudderth
Chief Justice

Do Not Publish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

Delivered: December 10, 2020