

**TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN**

---

---

**NO. 03-17-00407-CR**

---

---

**Kami Hanlon Appellant**

**v.**

**The State of Texas, Appellee**

---

---

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF WILLIAMSON COUNTY, 277TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
NO. 16-3070-K277 HONORABLE RICK KENNON, JUDGE PRESIDING**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant Kami Hanlon seeks to appeal the trial court's denial of her request for release on personal bond. Courts of appeals do not have jurisdiction to review interlocutory orders in a criminal appeal unless that jurisdiction has been expressly granted by law. *Ragston v. State*, 424 S.W.3d 49, 52 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014) (citing *Apolinar v. State*, 820 S.W.2d 792, 794 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991)). There is no constitutional or statutory authority granting appellate courts jurisdiction to review interlocutory orders regarding excessive bail or the denial of bail.<sup>1</sup> *Ragston*,

---

<sup>1</sup> We recognize that courts of appeals do have jurisdiction to review denials of applications for pretrial writs of habeas corpus challenging bail determinations. *Ex parte Smith*, 486 S.W.3d 62, 64 n.4 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 2016, no pet.); *see also Ex parte Gill*, 413 S.W.3d 425, 427-28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013) (concluding trial court abused discretion in denying application for writ of habeas corpus based on refusal to release defendant on personal custody or to reduce amount of bail under article 17.151 of code of criminal procedure). In this case, there is no indication that Hanlon filed an application for writ of habeas corpus and that she is now attempting to appeal the trial court's denial of that application.

424 S.W.3d at 52. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(f).

---

Scott K. Field, Justice

Before Chief Justice Rose, Justices Field and Bourland

Dismissed for Want of Jurisdiction

Filed: June 30, 2017

Do Not Publish