

**NO. 12-17-00215-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

***BRESHAWN CATHEY,  
APPELLANT***

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 241ST***

***V.***

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

***THE STATE OF TEXAS,  
APPELLEE***

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

---

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION***

Breshawn Cathey appeals his conviction for aggravated robbery. In one issue, he argues that his punishment violated his right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment because it was grossly disproportionate to the crime for which he was convicted. We affirm.

**BACKGROUND**

Appellant was charged by indictment with aggravated robbery, a first degree felony, punishable by not less than five years but not more than ninety-nine years or life imprisonment. Appellant entered an “open” plea of guilty to the offense as charged in the indictment with no agreed punishment recommendation. After a punishment hearing, the trial court found Appellant “guilty” of aggravated assault, and assessed his punishment at twelve years imprisonment. This appeal followed.

**CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT**

In his sole issue, Appellant argues that the twelve year sentence imposed by the trial court is grossly disproportionate to the crime committed and amounts to cruel and unusual punishment. In his brief, Appellant contends that the sentence is grossly disproportionate to the crime because

he had no violent criminal history, no weapon was used during the assault, and the victim's life was never in danger.

“To preserve for appellate review a complaint that a sentence is grossly disproportionate, constituting cruel and unusual punishment, a defendant must present to the trial court a timely request, objection, or motion stating the specific grounds for the ruling desired.” *Kim v. State*, 283 S.W.3d 473, 475 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2009, pet. ref'd); *see also Rhoades v. State*, 934 S.W.2d 113, 120 (Tex. Crim. App. 1996) (waiver of complaint of cruel and unusual punishment under the Texas Constitution because defendant presented his argument for first time on appeal); *Curry v. State*, 910 S.W.2d 490, 497 (Tex. Crim. App. 1995) (defendant waived complaint that statute violated his rights under the United States Constitution when raised for first time on appeal); *Mays v. State*, 285 S.W.3d 884, 889 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009) (“Preservation of error is a systemic requirement that a first-level appellate court should ordinarily review on its own motion[;] ... it [is] incumbent upon the [c]ourt itself to take up error preservation as a threshold issue.”); TEX. R. APP. P. 33.1. A review of the record shows that Appellant lodged no objection to the constitutionality of his sentence at the trial court level, and has, therefore, failed to preserve error for appellate review. *See Kim*, 283 S.W.3d at 475; *see also Rhoades*, 934 S.W.2d at 120; *Curry*, 910 S.W.2d at 497; *Mays*, 285 S.W.3d at 889; TEX. R. APP. P. 33.1.

However, despite Appellant's failure to preserve error, we conclude his sentence does not constitute cruel and unusual punishment. The Eighth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that “[e]xcessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.” U.S. CONST. amend. VIII. This provision was made applicable to the states by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Meadoux v. State*, 325 S.W.3d 189, 193 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010) (*citing Robinson v. California*, 370 U.S. 660, 666–667, 82 S. Ct. 1417, 1420–21, 8 L. Ed. 2d 758 (1962)).

The legislature is vested with the power to define crimes and prescribe penalties. *See Davis v. State*, 905 S.W.2d 655, 664 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1995, pet. ref'd); *see also Simmons v. State*, 944 S.W.2d 11, 15 (Tex. App.—Tyler 1996, pet. ref'd). Courts have repeatedly held that punishment which falls within the limits prescribed by a valid statute is not excessive, cruel, or unusual. *See Harris v. State*, 656 S.W.2d 481, 486 (Tex. Crim. App. 1983); *Jordan v. State*, 495 S.W.2d 949, 952 (Tex. Crim. App. 1973); *Davis*, 905 S.W.2d at 664. In this case, Appellant was convicted of aggravated robbery, the punishment range for which is five to ninety-nine

years, or life imprisonment. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. §§ 12.32, 29.03(a)(3)(A), (b) (West 2011). Thus, the sentence imposed by the trial court falls within the range set forth by the legislature. Therefore, the punishment is not prohibited as cruel, unusual, or excessive per se. See *Harris*, 656 S.W.2d at 486; *Jordan*, 495 S.W.2d at 952; *Davis*, 905 S.W.2d at 664.

Nevertheless, Appellant urges the court to perform the three part test originally set forth in *Solem v. Helm*, 463 U.S. 277, 103 S. Ct. 3001, 77 L. Ed. 2d 637 (1983). Under this test, the proportionality of a sentence is evaluated by considering (1) the gravity of the offense and the harshness of the penalty, (2) the sentences imposed on other criminals in the same jurisdiction, and (3) the sentences imposed for commission of the same crime in other jurisdictions. *Id.*, 463 U.S. at 292, 103 S. Ct. at 3011. The application of the *Solem* test has been modified by Texas courts and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Harmelin v. Michigan*, 501 U.S. 957, 111 S. Ct. 2680, 115 L. Ed. 2d 836 (1991) to require a threshold determination that the sentence is grossly disproportionate to the crime before addressing the remaining elements. See, e.g., *McGruder v. Puckett*, 954 F.2d 313, 316 (5th Cir. 1992), cert. denied, 506 U.S. 849, 113 S. Ct. 146, 121 L. Ed. 2d 98 (1992); see also *Jackson v. State*, 989 S.W.2d 842, 845–46 (Tex. App.–Texarkana 1999, no pet.).

We are guided by the holding in *Rummel v. Estelle* in making the threshold determination of whether Appellant's sentence is grossly disproportionate to his crime. 445 U.S. 263, 100 S. Ct. 1133, 63 L. Ed. 2d 382 (1980). In *Rummel*, the Supreme Court considered the proportionality claim of an appellant who had received a mandatory life sentence under a prior version of the Texas habitual offender statute for a conviction of obtaining \$120.75 by false pretenses. See *id.*, 445 U.S. at 266, 100 S. Ct. at 1135. In that case, the appellant received a life sentence because he had two prior felony convictions—one for fraudulent use of a credit card to obtain \$80 worth of goods or services and the other for passing a forged check in the amount of \$28.36. *Id.*, 445 U.S. at 265–66, 100 S. Ct. at 1134–35. After recognizing the legislative prerogative to classify offenses as felonies and, further, considering the purpose of the habitual offender statute, the court determined that the appellant's mandatory life sentence did not constitute cruel and unusual punishment. *Id.*, 445 U.S. at 284–85, 100 S. Ct. at 1144–45.

In this case, the evidence also showed that Appellant assaulted a seventy-one year old man in order to steal money from him, was under the influence of marijuana and prescription drugs that he obtained illegally, i.e., Ecstasy and Xanax, when he committed the robbery, and

attempted to flee from law enforcement. The offense committed by Appellant—aggravated robbery—is far more serious than the combination of offenses committed by the appellant in *Rummel*, while Appellant’s twelve year sentence is far less severe than the life sentence upheld by the Supreme Court in *Rummell*. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that if the sentence in *Rummell* is not constitutionally disproportionate, neither is the sentence assessed against Appellant in this case. Because we do not conclude that Appellant’s sentence is disproportionate to his crime, we need not apply the remaining elements of the *Solem* test. Appellant’s sole issue is overruled.

**DISPOSITION**

Having overruled Appellant’s sole issue, we *affirm* the judgment of the trial court.

**BRIAN HOYLE**  
Justice

Opinion delivered April 25, 2018.

*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

APRIL 25, 2018

NO. 12-17-00215-CR

**BRESHAWN CATHEY,**  
Appellant  
V.  
**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**  
Appellee

---

Appeal from the 241st District Court  
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 241-1702-16)

---

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record and briefs filed herein, and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this court that there was no error in the judgment.

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the judgment of the court below **be in all things affirmed**, and that this decision be certified to the court below for observance.

Brian Hoyle, Justice.  
*Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Hoyle, J., and Neeley, J.*