NO. 12-17-00154-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

NAKITA MONTEAGO WICKWARE, APPELLANT § APPEAL FROM THE

V.

§ COUNTY COURT AT LAW

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

§ SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS

MEMORANDUM OPINION PER CURIAM

Nakita Monteago Wickware filed an interlocutory appeal from the denial of a motion to suppress. On May 18, 2017, this Court notified Appellant that the notice of appeal failed to show the jurisdiction of the Court, namely, there is no final judgment or appealable order. We further notified Appellant that the appeal would be dismissed unless the information was amended on or before June 19 to show the jurisdiction of the Court. In response, Appellant acknowledges that there is no appealable order and that the appeal should be dismissed. Because this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider interlocutory appeals from the denial of a motion to suppress, we *dismiss* Appellant's appeal for *want of jurisdiction*. *See Dahlem v. State*, 322 S.W.3d 685, 690-91 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2010, pet. ref'd); *see also Foeller v. State*, No. 03-16-00616-CR, 2017 WL 393579 (Tex. App.—Austin Jan. 24, 2017, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication); Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(f).

Opinion delivered June 14, 2017.

Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Hoyle, J., and Neeley, J.

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

JUNE 14, 2017

NO. 12-17-00154-CR

NAKITA MONTEAGO WICKWARE, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the County Court at Law of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 001-80366-17)

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record; and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this court that this court is without jurisdiction of the appeal, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED by this court that this appeal be, and the same is, hereby **dismissed for want of jurisdiction**; and that this decision be certified to the court below for observance.

By per curiam opinion.

Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Hoyle, J. and Neeley, J.