

**NOS. 12-19-00125-CR
12-19-00126-CR
12-19-00127-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

TYLER, TEXAS

***ALEXANDRO CAMACHO,
APPELLANT***

§ *APPEALS FROM THE 7TH*

V.

§ *JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT*

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

§ *SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS*

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

These appeals are being dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Alexandro Camacho, acting pro se, filed a notice of appeal in trial court cause numbers 007-0567-06, 007-0884-11, and 007-0568-06. Sentence was imposed on August 7, 2006, in cause number 007-0567-06 and October 25, 2011, in cause number 007-0884-11. Cause number 007-0568-06 was dismissed on August 11, 2006. Under the rules of appellate procedure, the notice of appeal must be filed within thirty days after the sentence is imposed or within ninety days after sentence is imposed if the defendant timely files a motion for new trial. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 26.2(a). Rule 26.3 provides that a motion to extend the time for filing a notice of appeal must be filed within fifteen days after the deadline for filing the notice of appeal. TEX. R. APP. P. 26.3. In this case, Appellant filed his notice of appeal on April 5, 2019, long after the time for filing a notice of appeal under Rule 26.2(a) or for seeking a motion to extend under Rule 26.3.

On April 5, this Court notified Appellant that the information received failed to show the jurisdiction of the Court, i.e., there is no new final judgment or appealable order contained therein. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 26.2, 26.3. We informed Appellant that the appeal would be dismissed unless the information was amended on or before May 6 to show this Court's jurisdiction. On May 2,

Appellant’s newly appointed counsel filed a memorandum of law regarding jurisdiction and the timely filing of notice of appeal, in which he states that Appellant did not timely file his notice of appeal in any of the cases. He states that “Appellant cannot establish a legal basis by which the Court could claim jurisdiction over these matters” and expresses his belief that dismissal is required. We agree.

“[I]n Texas, appeals by either the State or the defendant in a criminal case are permitted only when they are specifically authorized by statute.” *State ex rel. Lykos v. Fine*, 330 S.W.3d 904, 915 (Tex. Crim. App. 2011). This Court is not authorized to extend the time for perfecting an appeal except as provided by the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure.¹ See TEX. R. APP. P. 26.2, 26.3; see also *Slaton v. State*, 981 S.W.2d 208, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 1998); *Olivo v. State*, 918 S.W.2d 519, 522 (Tex. Crim. App. 1996). In the present case, Appellant’s appeals are untimely. Accordingly, we *dismiss* Appellant’s appeals for *want of jurisdiction*. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2(f).

Opinion delivered May 8, 2019.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

¹ Only the court of criminal appeals has jurisdiction to grant an out-of-time appeal. See *Ater v. Eighth Court of Appeals*, 802 S.W.2d 241, 243 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); see also *Kossie v. State*, No. 01-16-00738-CR, 2017 WL 631842, at *1-2 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Feb. 16, 2017, no pet. h.) (mem. op., not designated for publication) (dismissing for lack of jurisdiction because appellant could not pursue out of time appeal without permission from court of criminal appeals); see TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. art 11.07 § 3(a) (West 2005).



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

MAY 8, 2019

NO. 12-19-00125-CR

ALEXANDRO CAMACHO,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 7th District Court

of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 007-0567-06)

THIS CAUSE came on to be heard on the appellate record, and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this Court that it 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.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

MAY 8, 2019

NO. 12-19-00126-CR

ALEXANDRO CAMACHO,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 7th District Court

of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 007-0884-11)

THIS CAUSE came on to be heard on the appellate record, and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this Court that it 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.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

MAY 8, 2019

NO. 12-19-00127-CR

ALEXANDRO CAMACHO,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 7th District Court

of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 007-0568-06)

THIS CAUSE came on to be heard on the appellate record, and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this Court that it 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.