

**NOS. 12-19-00234-CR
12-19-00235-CR
12-19-00236-CR
12-19-00237-CR**

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

***PAUL LAMAR BOWIE,
APPELLANT***

§ ***APPEALS FROM THE 114TH***

V.

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

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

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Paul Lamar Bowie, acting pro se, filed a notice of appeal in trial court cause numbers 114-1138-05, 114-1139-05, 114-1140-05, and 114-0047-13. Under the rules of appellate procedure, the notice of appeal must be filed within thirty days after the sentence is imposed or suspended in open court, or after the day the trial court enters an appealable order; or within ninety days 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, sentence was imposed on October 13, 2005, in cause numbers 114-1138-05, 114-1139-05, and 114-1140-05, and imposed on February 28, 2013, in cause number 114-0047-13. Appellant filed his notice of appeal on June 13, 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 June 21, this Court notified Appellant that the information received failed to show the jurisdiction of the Court, i.e., there was no notice of appeal filed within the time allowed by the rules of appellate procedure and no timely motion for an extension of time to file the notice of

appeal. See TEX. R. APP. P. 26.2, 26.3. We informed Appellant that the appeals would be dismissed unless the information was amended on or before July 1 to show this Court's jurisdiction. This deadline passed without a response from Appellant.

“[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). Accordingly, we *dismiss* Appellant's appeals for *want of jurisdiction*. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2(f).

Opinion delivered July 10, 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

JULY 10, 2019

NO. 12-19-00234-CR

PAUL LAMAR BOWIE,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-1138-05)

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.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

JULY 10, 2019

NO. 12-19-00235-CR

PAUL LAMAR BOWIE,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-1139-05)

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.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

JULY 10, 2019

NO. 12-19-00236-CR

PAUL LAMAR BOWIE,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-1140-05)

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.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

JULY 10, 2019

NO. 12-19-00237-CR

PAUL LAMAR BOWIE,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-0047-05)

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.