

## **PDR GRANTED ISSUES**

NOTE:THE WORDING OF THE ISSUES IS TAKEN VERBATIM FROM THE PARTIES' PETITIONS  
FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW.

**NO ISSUES GRANTED OCTOBER 1, 2026**

---

## **ALPHABETICAL LISTING WITHOUT ISSUES**

| <b><u>PDR NO.</u></b> | <b><u>NAME</u></b>                        | <b><u>DATE GRANTED</u></b> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 26-0257               | AGUIRRE, ERIK                             | 09/03/26                   |
| 26-0143               | BACON, KEVIN WILLIAMS                     | 08/20/26                   |
| 25-0839/40            | BALLESTER, ISRAEL II                      | 03/05/25                   |
| 25-0541               | BARRERA, GREG ANTHONY III                 | 01/29/26                   |
| 25-0742-822           | BARRERA, YOHANA INES et al                | 06/11/26                   |
| 24-0790               | BLOXHAM, THOMAS JOSEPH                    | 01/22/25                   |
| 26-0072               | BURGOS-AVILES, RONALD ANTHONY             | 06/04/26                   |
| 25-0452               | COLLINS, NATHAN GENE                      | 10/16/25                   |
| 25-0651               | CRUMLEY, JOHN PAUL                        | 01/22/26                   |
| 26-0135-39            | DELANEY, CONNER JEFFERY                   | 06/04/26                   |
| 26-0053               | EATON, JORDAN ALEXANDER                   | 06/25/26                   |
| 26-0076               | GONZALEZ, ANDREW ABEL                     | 06/25/26                   |
| 25-0574               | HAMMONS, HOUSTON SAMUEL                   | 10/30/25                   |
| 25-0929               | HERNANDEZ, FRANK III                      | 05/21/26                   |
| 25-0135/36            | JAIMES, YOCELIN PEREZ                     | 05/28/25                   |
| 26-0041               | JOHNSON, NOAH MICHAEL                     | 06/25/26                   |
| 25-0873               | LAMNISSOS, MARIOS MICHAEL                 | 04/30/26                   |
| 25-0621               | MADAS, NITIN KUMAR                        | 01/15/26                   |
| 26-0598               | MARMOLEJO-PALACIOS, EX PARTE JOSE ELEAZAR | 09/17/26                   |
| 26-0166/67            | MARTIN, EX PARTE BESSIE TEKILA            | 09/03/26                   |
| 26-0266               | MARTINEZ, ERICK                           | 09/03/26                   |
| 25-0643/44            | MASON, PAUL DAVID                         | 01/29/26                   |
| 25-0358               | MEJIA, FABIAN                             | 07/30/25                   |
| 25-1034               | MORRIS, MICHAEL JOSEPH                    | 04/09/26                   |
| 25-0932               | MOTEN, HERBERT WAYNE                      | 04/02/26                   |
| 25-0932               | MOTEN, HERBERT WAYNE (Rehearing)          | 06/25/26                   |
| 25-0981               | NEUSER, NATHANIEL                         | 04/30/26                   |
| 25-0523               | NGUYEN, DE H                              | 01/22/26                   |
| 26-0337               | PALOMARES, ALEXANDER GONZALEZ             | 08/20/26                   |
| 25-1009               | PATTERSON, ANTHONY JORDAN                 | 05/07/26                   |
| 26-0157               | PERDOMO-MEJIA, ENRIQUE                    | 08/20/26                   |
| 24-0850-52            | PEREZ, GILBERTO                           | 01/29/25                   |
| 25-0715               | PHILPOT, PATRICK                          | 04/02/26                   |
| 26-0013               | PITTS-MARSHALL, DEMONTRE JALEEL           | 05/07/26                   |
| 26-0014               | RIOS, MANUEL                              | 05/21/26                   |
| 26-0019               | SALAZAR, REYES                            | 05/07/26                   |
| 26-0597               | SAMPIERO, EX PARTE ALONSO ISLAS           | 09/17/26                   |
| 25-0233               | STOCKER, JAMIN KIDRON                     | 02/26/26                   |
| 24-0866               | SUAREZ, SAUL LEE                          | 01/29/25                   |
| 24-0877               | TAYLOR, DYLAN EUGENE                      | 01/22/25                   |
| 25-0872               | TOLENTINO, SOSTENES LORENZO               | 05/21/26                   |
| 25-0585               | VALDEZ, LUIS ALBERTO                      | 04/16/26                   |
| 26-0376               | VIGIL, MARK ANTHONY                       | 09/03/26                   |

|             |                             |          |
|-------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| 25-0074     | WEAVER, QUALON DESHON       | 04/09/25 |
| 26-0147     | WILBERT, EX PARTE COREY     | 08/20/26 |
| 25-0479     | WILLIAMS, KENDARIUS         | 11/20/25 |
| 26-0190-248 | ZURITA, MELVIN ISMAEL et al | 06/11/26 |

## NUMERICAL LISTING WITH ISSUES GRANTED

**24-0790**

**BLOXHAM, THOMAS JOSEPH**

**01/22/25**

### **THEFT**

#### **STATE’S**

1. Can a court determine that the State’s use of immunized testimony violated *Kastigar v. United States*, 406 U.S. 441 (1972), without knowing the substance of that immunized testimony?
2. What is the proper framework to use for presentation and review of a *Kastigar* claim, including invocation, burden of proof, harm analysis, and remedy?

**24-0850-0852**

**PEREZ, GILBERTO**

**01/29/25**

### **AGGRAVATED ASSAULT**

### **MURDER**

### **POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE**

#### **APPELLEE’S**

1. The lower court’s opinion arguing that the plain-view doctrine is equivalent to standing and can be raised for the first time on appeal creates a split amongst the appellate courts that must be resolved by this Court. *State v. Elrod*, 395 S.W.3d 869 (Tex. App.—Austin 2013).
2. Is the plain-view doctrine equivalent to a standing issue that falls within the waiver exception, allowing the State to raise it for the first time on appeal?
3. Did the appellate court afford the trial court proper deference in overturning its order based on a legal theory the trial court was not given an opportunity to rule on?
4. Did the appellate court erroneously apply the plain-view doctrine?
5. Did the appellate court erroneously apply the independent source doctrine?
6. Did the appellate court err in overruling the trial court’s finding that the arrest warrant for possession was not supported by probable cause?
7. Did the appellate court err in finding the trial court owed the magistrate’s finding deference where the warrant affidavit was based on illegally obtained information?

**24-0866**

**SUAREZ, SAUL LEE**

**01/29/25**

### **MURDER**

#### **STATE’S**

A majority of the court of appeals erred in finding that the lead detective was not reasonable in believing that Appellee's mother had apparent authority to consent to the search of her apartment, including Appellee’s bedroom.

**24-0877**

**TAYLOR, DYLAN EUGENE**

**01/22/25**

### **POSSESSION OF FIREARM BY A FELON**

#### **STATE’S**

The Court of Appeals erred in interpreting this Court's prior rulings to require strict, mechanical compliance with inventory policy, putting it at odds with other courts of appeal holding the contrary.

**25-0074**

**WEAVER, QUALON DESHON**

**04/09/25**

**EVADING ARREST WITH VEHICLE**

**STATE'S**

1. What role, if any, do a defendant's personal experiences play in the determination of whether his perception of imminent harm is reasonable?
2. Are the reasonableness of both a defendant's perception of necessity and his response wholly within the discretion of the jury, or can a court decide either is unreasonable as a matter of law?
3. Must a harm analysis for charge error consider the likelihood that the outcome would have been different had the jury been properly instructed?
4. Was appellant entitled to an instruction on necessity and, if so, a new trial?

**25-0135/0136**

**JAIMES, YOCELIN PEREZ**

**05/28/25**

**INDECENCY WITH A CHILD**

**STATE'S**

1. Should *Cook v. State*, 884 S.W.2d 485 (Tex. Crim. App. 1994), be overruled to the extent it holds that failing to limit the mental state definitions to the right conduct-element is error even when the jury charge otherwise leaves no doubt what the mental state requires?
3. Should failure to limit the abstract definition result in some harm in the absence of anyone telling jurors they could convict on something less than the offense requires?

**25-0233**

**STOCKER, JAMIN KIDRON**

**02/26/26**

**CAPITAL MURDER**

**APPELLANT'S**

Does a search warrant affidavit provide probable cause to obtain the contents of Appellant's cell phone when the facts relied on to establish a nexus between the phone and a crime under investigation consist of an anonymous, unverified tip?

**COURT'S OWN MOTION**

Does the search warrant affidavit in Appellant's case establish a nexus between the cell phone and the criminal activity under investigation under *State v. Baldwin*, 664 S.W.3d 122 (Tex. Crim. App. 2022)?

**25-0358**

**MEJIA, FABIAN**

**07/30/25**

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT**

**STATE'S**

1. Does testimony of a narrowly limited portion of an interview mislead jurors and necessitate the admission of more of the interview to answer broader, unasked questions under Rule 107?
3. What standard for harm should be used when evaluating error regarding admissibility of evidence?

**25-0452**

**COLLINS, NATHAN GENE**

**10/16/25**

**UNLAWFUL POSSESSION OF A FIREARM**

**APPELLANT'S**

1. In holding that a defendant can be "convicted of illegal weapon possession and simultaneously subject to a deadly weapon finding" in the absence of a collateral felony to which the finding could attach, the Seventh Court of Appeals' decision conflicts with those of its sister courts; thus necessitating a review by this Court to resolve the issue. Tex. R. App. P. 66.3(a).

2. The Court of Appeals' decision regarding the propriety of the trial court's inclusion in the judgment against Respondent of a deadly weapon finding when there was no associated felony to which that finding could be attached conflicts with this Court's decision in *Plummer v. State*, and, thus, should be reviewed by the Court. Tex. R. App. P. 66.3(c).

**25-0479**

**WILLIAMS, KENDARIUS**

**11/20/25**

**MURDER**

**APPELLANT'S**

2. Can two extraneous shootings be admitted in a murder trial as same-transaction contextual evidence, when the undisputed testimony from an accomplice proved they were unrelated to the charged offense?

3. Can those same shootings be admitted to rebut a "defensive theory" that was raised by the State?

4. Does an appellate court err in holding that evidence of extraneous shootings is more probative than prejudicial because it tends to prove the defendant acted in conformity with that evidence?

5. Can photographs and Instagram posts related to firearms be admitted in a murder trial when that evidence either is not related to the offense, or is not related to the defendant?

**25-0523**

**NGUYEN, DE H**

**01/22/26**

**FELONY MURDER**

**APPELLANT'S**

Did the Court of Appeals err by treating *Wells* as binding authority rather than a hodgepodge of conflicting opinions with no controlling majority?

**STATE'S**

3. If this Court grants review of Defendant-Appellant's petition, before even reaching any advisory *Wells* issues, should it first recognize that the third-party doctrine independently supports affirming Appellant's judgment?

**25-0541**

**BARRERA, GREG ANTHONY III**

**01/29/26**

**MURDER**

**APPELLANT'S**

1. Should the inquiry for motive to testify for the State be limited to the existence of criminal proceedings against a witness?

**COURT'S OWN MOTION**

2. Should the Court reconsider or clarify any aspect of its decision in *Irby v. State*, 327 S.W.3d 138 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010)?

**25-0574**

**HAMMONS, HOUSTON SAMUEL**

**10/30/25**

**ASSAULT—FAMILY VIOLENCE—BY IMPEDING BREATH OR CIRCULATION**

**APPELLANT’S**

The Sixth Court of Appeals erred in holding that a point of error briefed on direct appeal was waived for failing to brief harm.

**25-0585** **VALDEZ, LUIS ALBERTO** **04/16/26**

---

**INDECENCY WITH A CHILD**

**COURT’S OWN MOTION**

Did the court of appeals err in holding that the trial court did not abuse its discretion in overruling Appellant's objection to testimony that "[t]hese children were believable"?

**25-0621** **MADAS, NITIN KUMAR** **01/15/26**

---

**POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE**

**STATE’S**

1. Contrary to the court of appeals’s holding, review of the video shows appellant’s consent to search was voluntary and nothing like the oppressive 4-on-1 situation described in *Carmouche v. State*, 10 S.W.3d 323 (Tex. Crim. App. 2000).

**25-0643/0644** **MASON, PAUL DAVID** **01/29/26**

---

**POSSESSION AND POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DELIVER**

**COURT’S OWN MOTION**

Should the Court reconsider or clarify any aspect of its decision in *Ex parte Delaney*, 207 S.W.3d 794 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006)?

**25-0651** **CRUMLEY, JOHN PAUL** **01/22/26**

---

**ONLINE SOLICITATION OF A MINOR**

**APPELLANT’S**

1. Did the appellate court err by applying the heightened "directly-rebut-or-truly negate" requirement for mental-disease evidence to the defendant's brothers' testimony, which consisted of observational evidence of his tendency to think a certain way and his behavioral characteristics and background evidence supporting his defense?

**25-0715** **PHILPOT, PATRICK** **04/02/26**

---

**FORGERY OF A FINANCIAL INSTRUMENT**

**APPELLANT’S**

1. Whether the court of appeals correctly concluded that the cashier’s check purported to be the act of an entity called “PacPhil Bank.”

2. One of the essential elements of forgery is that the writing purports to be the act of another who did not authorize the act. Does the statutory definition of “another” require the person to be a real individual or entity?

3. Whether a cashier's check embodying the purported act of a fictitious entity is void on its face and, therefore, not a forgery.

4. Whether the court of appeals correctly found that the exclusion of the statutory definition of "another" and the accompanying pertinent statutory definitions of "person," "individual," "corporation," and "association" from the jury charge did not egregiously harm Petitioner when those definitions were critical to the jury's determination of whether the State proved beyond a reasonable doubt that Petitioner's act purported to be the act of another.

---

**25-0742-0822                      BARRERA, YOHANA INES ET AL**

**06/11/26**

**PARTICIPATING IN A RIOT**

**STATE'S**

1. The Court of Appeals erred in upholding the dismissal of the indictments for the State's failure to produce evidence to buttress the presumption of regularity, and wrongly treated such as a jurisdictional defect.

2. Does Code of Criminal Procedure article 21.30 operate to prevent the dismissal of a case where a re-transfer to the district court would be the proper remedy to cure any alleged transfer defects?

---

**25-0839/0840                      BALLESTER, ISRAEL II**

**03/05/26**

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT**

**STATE'S**

1. Does submission of an instruction on provoking the difficulty, Tex. Penal Code § 9.31(b)(4), require evidence that the difficulty was a scheme to manufacture a claim of self-defense?

2. If so, should the jury be given non-statutory instructions on the pretextual nature of the provocation?

---

**25-0872                              TOLENTINO, SOSTENES LORENZO**

**05/21/26**

**DWI**

**APPELLANT'S**

2. The court of appeals erred in reviewing this case solely as a due process matter, when this Court holds that the failure of a trial court to provide a defendant a trial in a language he can speak and comprehend is a Sixth Amendment issue.

3. Even if the trial court's decision is reviewed solely for an abuse of discretion, the court of appeals erred in how it applied that standard to the record in this case.

---

**25-0873                              LAMNISSOS, MARIOS MICHAEL**

**04/30/26**

**ASSAULT-FAMILY VIOLENCE**

**APPELLANT'S**

1. When a defendant has knowingly and competently invoked his right to self-representation, may a trial court terminate that right based on questioning it deems irrelevant or repetitive, without explicit findings of deliberate obstructionist misconduct? May an appellate court affirm such termination by applying "almost total deference"?

2. When a trial court revokes a defendant's right to self-representation mid-trial and forces unprepared standby counsel to take over against the defendant's wishes, can the court deny a continuance, violating the defendant's due process rights and leaving the defendant with neither autonomy nor effective assistance of counsel?

**25-0929**

**HERNANDEZ, FRANK III**

**05/21/26**

**AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ASSAULT**

**APPELLANT'S**

1. The court of appeals erred in holding that Appellant inadequately briefed his claim that the trial court abused its discretion by denying his motion for new trial based on newly discovered or newly available evidence from Joe Ramirez, the only independent eyewitness who corroborated his justification defense, thereby misapplying Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 38.1(i) and avoiding the merits of a preserved constitutional and statutory claim under Tex. Code Crim. Proc. art. 40.001 and Carsner.

**25-0932**

**MOTEN, HERBERT WAYNE**

**04/02/26**

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT**

**STATE'S**

1. Should *State v. Heath*, 696 S.W.3d 677 (Tex. Crim. App. 2024), be overruled and "state" in the discovery statute be interpreted to mean the prosecutor's office?

2. Should *State v. Heath*, 696 S.W.3d 677 (Tex. Crim. App. 2024), be overruled and "state" be interpreted to mean "the prosecution"---i.e., those that participate in the investigation or prosecution of the offense?

**25-0932**

**MOTEN, HERBERT WAYNE**

**06/25/26**

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT**

**APPELLANT'S (Rehearing)**

1. The Court erred in overlooking the significance of the discovery's and/or jail calls harm in infecting the minds of the jury which is stated in the Petitioner's Petition and did not apply the "Use Before the Jury" Rule in its decision.

2. The Court erred in overlooking how defendant's substantial rights were affected.

3. The Court erred in overlooking [that] the jail calls were of constitutional vestige and a constitutional error.

**25-0981**

**NEUSER, NATHANIEL**

**04/30/26**

**INDECENCY WITH A CHILE (2 COUNTS), INJURY TO A CHILD (2 COUNTS)**

**STATE'S**

1. After providing a full opportunity for voir dire, does a trial court abuse its discretion by refusing to permit a party to individually re-question veniremembers whose qualifications are ambiguous only because of the party's own questions?

2. Is a juror subject to a challenge for cause if he indicates that he would either "always or almost always" believe that officers are more truthful than other witnesses?

**25-1009**

**PATTERSON, ANTHONY JORDAN**

**05/07/26**

**ENGAGING IN ORGANIZED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY (2 COUNTS), MURDER, ASSAULT-BODILY INJURY**

**APPELLANT'S**

2. Is the Court of Criminal Appeals' holding in O'Brien v. State applicable to EOCA when a person is charged as being a member of a criminal street gang rather than being part of a combination?

**25-1034**

**MORRIS, MICHAEL JOSEPH**

**04/09/26**

**DWI**

**APPELLANT'S**

Did the court of appeals incorrectly dismiss Petitioner's appeal for want of jurisdiction, when Petitioner attempted to timely file his new trial motion on July 11, 2025, which was rejected by the county clerk's office because of a formatting error when a deputy clerk misinterpreted the e-filing rules, causing this motion to be file-marked with an untimely date, instead of the timely earlier attempted filing date?

**26-0013**

**PITTS-MARSHALL, DEMONTRE JALEEL**

**05/07/26**

**ASSAULT**

**APPELLANT'S**

2. Does a federal law enforcement agent "lawfully discharge an official duty" while making a state law misdemeanor arrest when Texas law allows a federal agent to make only state law felony arrests?

**26-0014**

**RIOS, MANUEL**

**05/21/26**

**SEXUAL ASSAULT (6 COUNTS), ATTEMPTED SEXUAL ASSAULT**

**APPELLEE'S**

1. Did the Court of Appeals err by overturning the trial court's conclusion that the search warrant affidavit was legally unsworn, and the search warrant of Appellee's phone was facially defective pursuant to Texas Code of Criminal Procedure Article 18.0215(c) such that the good faith exception of Article 38.23(b) did not apply to this case?

2. If a good-faith exception analysis is required, did the Court of Appeals err by extending that exception to a case where the two law enforcement officers and the signing judge were unaware of a ten-year old statute that contained mandatory language reflecting an elevated concern for the privacy rights for the issuance of a search warrant for an electronic communications device?

**26-0019**

**SALAZAR, REYES**

**05/07/26**

**CONTINUOUS SEXUAL ABUSE OF A YOUNG CHILD, AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ASSAULT OF A CHILD**

**COURT'S OWN MOTION**

1. Did the court of appeals err to conclude that having ten regular jurors and two alternate jurors participate in the deliberation of Appellant's guilt or innocence, when all twelve regular jurors were present and able and apparently willing to participate in deliberations, did not violate Article V, Section 13, of the Texas Constitution?

2. Did the court of appeals err to conclude that any error in having two alternate jurors inside the jury room and actively participating in deliberations, in violation of Article 36.22 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure, was harmless under Rule 44.2(b) of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure?

**26-0041**

**JOHNSON, NOAH MICHAEL**

**06/25/26**

**ASSAULT—FAMILY VIOLENCE, ASSAULT—FAMILY VIOLENCE BY IMPEDING BREATH OR CIRCULATION**

**STATE’S**

The Third Court erred in reversing Appellant's 'Assault Family Violence' convictions based on its erroneous conclusion the charges failed to allege the same conduct, same act, or same transaction as his Attempt to Commit Murder charge; its holding will have negative consequences for the State and all victims of criminal conduct, and it conflicts with its sister Courts' and this Court's precedent.

**COURT’S OWN MOTION**

Whether the Court’s opinions in *Hernandez v. State*, 127 S.W.3d 768 (Tex. Crim. App. 2004), *Marks v. State*, 560 S.W.3d 169 (Tex. Crim. App. 2018), and/or *State v. West*, 632 S.W.3d 908 (Tex. Crim. App. 2021), should be reconsidered.

**26-0053**

**EATON, JORDAN ALEXANDER**

**06/25/26**

**MURDER, AGGRAVATED ASSAULT**

**STATE’S**

1. Did Eaton's objection preserve error under Rule 403 or under Due Process?
3. Did the court of appeals err by concluding that the trial court should be reversed because of a single question that violated Crawford and because the trial court admitted a six second video of Eaton in restraints?

**COURT’S OWN MOTION**

Whether the court of appeals erred by failing to afford appropriate deference to the trial court on the admissibility of the evidence.

**26-0072**

**BURGOS-AVILES, RONALD ANTHONY**

**06/04/26**

**CAPITAL MURDER (2 COUNTS)**

**APPELLANT’S**

The Court of Appeals' rationale for rejecting Appellant's claim that the trial court erred in discharging his second-chair attorney and appointed a new one over his objection fails to properly apply the relevant caselaw.

**26-0076**

**GONZALEZ, ANDREW ABEL**

**06/25/26**

**OFFICIAL OPPRESSION**

**APPELLEE’S**

The Thirteenth Court of Appeals opinion has erroneously expanded First Amendment rights of the public to transparency in law enforcement conduct, to include a right to eavesdrop and surreptitiously record conversations intended by officers to be private, and made during ongoing investigations.

**26-0135-0139**

**DELANEY, CONNER JEFFERY**

**06/04/26**

**PROMOTION OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY (5 COUNTS)**

### **APPELLANT'S**

1. The appellate court misconstrued the statutory mens rea requirement by applying the incorrect standard to the specific charge and, subsequently, erred in permitting a finding of knowledge without proof that Appellant was aware his conduct was reasonably certain to cause the result in Texas.
2. The court of appeals' determination that Texas possessed territorial jurisdiction conflicts with prior appellate court decisions that the court itself acknowledged as instructive yet failed to follow in reaching its holding

**26-0143**

**BACON, KEVIN WILLIAMS**

**08/20/26**

### **DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED**

### **STATE'S**

1. When the jury heard some evidence that raised the possibility of ingestion of a drug in addition to alcohol, must the trial court restrict the definition of "intoxicated" to alcohol under *Burnett v. State*?
2. Did the Fourteenth Court of Appeals conflate the some harm standard from *Burnett v. State* with the egregious harm standard for unpreserved jury charge error when it found the complete definition of "intoxicated" egregiously harmful in this case?

**26-0147**

**WILBERT, EX PARTE COREY**

**08/20/26**

### **MURDER**

### **APPELLEE'S**

1. Whether the court of appeals erred by rejecting Wilbert's contention that the State had forfeited appellate review under Code of Criminal Procedure Article 44.01(a)(7)(A)(i) by failing to apprise the trial court of its argument that the bond was insufficient.
2. Whether, in bail appeals under Code of Criminal Procedure Article 44.01(f-1)(1) and Rule of Appellate Procedure 31.8(h)(1) — which require "a de novo review of all issues presented" — "all issues" includes factual determinations of the trial court as well as questions of law. Thus, whether the court of appeals erred by failing to defer to the trial court's factual determinations, opting instead to make de novo factual determinations from a cold record.

**26-0157**

**PERDOMO-MEJIA, ENRIQUE**

**08/20/26**

### **CONTINUOUS SEXUAL ABUSE OF A CHILD**

### **APPELLANT'S**

Is the presence of a uniformed, armed guard directly behind a defendant testifying at the guilt phase of trial inherently prejudicial to the presumption of innocence, in violation of due process under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution?

**26-0166/0167**

**MARTIN, EX PARTE BESSIE TEKILA**

**09/03/26**

### **CREDIT CARD OR DEBIT CARD ABUSE AGAINST AN ELDERLY INDIVIDUAL**

### **COURT'S OWN MOTION**

Whether the Court of Appeals's judgments remanding the cases for further record development finally disposed of the appeals and are therefore reviewable under *Jack v. State*.

**STATE'S**

Does TEX. R. APP. P. 31.3 authorize a court of appeals to remand a case to provide a habeas applicant a second full opportunity to make a record supporting her claim?

**26-0190-0248**

**ZURITA, MELVIN ISMAEL ET AL**

**06/11/26**

**PARTICIPATING IN A RIOT**

**STATE'S**

1. The court of appeals erred in affirming the dismissals of fifty-nine misdemeanor indictments by the trial court because: (1) the court of appeals misapplied this Court's long established case law that holds that a court document is deemed filed when it is placed in the custody or control of the clerk and, once in the clerk's custody or control, a party like the State is not responsible for and cannot be prejudiced by any errors or omissions of the court clerk; (2) no law or rule of procedure requires that grand jury indictments for misdemeanor offenses, as expressly permitted by the Texas Constitution, must first be filed in a district court, being a court without competent jurisdiction, before the indictment can be transferred and filed in a county court, a court of appropriate jurisdiction; (3) no law or rule of procedure requires that documents tendered to a court clerk for filing be physically affixed together by staples or other means; and (4) any transfer defects that exist are procedural and non-jurisdictional in nature pursuant to the 1985 constitutional and statutory amendments rejecting a hyper-technical approach to measure the validity of indictments.

2. Does Code of Criminal Procedure article 21.30 operate to prevent the dismissal of a case where a re-transfer to the grand-jury district court would be the proper remedy to cure any alleged transfer defects?

**26-0257**

**AGUIRRE, ERIK**

**09/03/26**

**MURDER**

**STATE'S**

1. Does an appellant have a waivable-only right that prohibits a trial judge from explaining the beyond a reasonable doubt standard?

2. Should an appellate court review a judge's voir dire comments as if they constitute jury charge error?

3. Does the Rule 44.2(a) constitutional harm standard apply to a trial judge's attempt to explain the beyond a reasonable doubt standard in voir dire?

**26-0266**

**MARTINEZ, ERICK**

**09/03/26**

**AGGRAVATED ROBBERY**

**APPELLANT'S**

The Court of Appeals erred by failing to consider the trial court's duty to inquire as to whether an interpreter was needed to protect the Appellant.

**26-0337**

**PALOMARES, ALEXANDER GONZALEZ**

**08/20/26**

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT, ASSAULT**

**APPELLANT'S**

This is a case where the trial court and 7th Court of Appeals basically held that article 39.14 doesn't mean what it says and that the Court of Criminal Appeals recent rulings about 39.14 do not mean what they say and the prosecutor disclosing for the first time damaging evidence in the middle of a trial can be upheld without the defense having an appropriate remedy for the late disclosure.

This is an issue as to whether the Mich[ael] Morton Act means anything or that trial judges can fashion a "remedy" that is illogical and disconnected from reality. The Court must reverse the incorrect opinion of the 7th Court of Appeals.

**26-0376**

**VIGIL, MARK ANTHONY**

**09/03/26**

**CAPITAL MURDER**

**STATE'S**

Did the lower court usurp the jury's inferencing-drawing role when it held that Appellant's act of shooting up the supposed victim's car was an intervening episode that extinguished his immediate flight from attempting to burglarize the victim's apartment when the jury could have found that: (1) the car shooting facilitated flight, or (2) he fled both offenses?

**26-0597**

**SAMPIERO, EX PARTE ALONSO ISLAS**

**09/17/26**

**CRIMINAL TRESPASS**

**APPELLANT'S**

2. Is a challenge to a bond conditioned on an impossible order cognizable in a pretrial writ and subject to interlocutory review?

**26-0598**

**MARMOLEJO-PALACIOS, EX PARTE JOSE ELEAZAR**

**09/17/26**

**CRIMINAL TRESPASS**

**APPELLANT'S**

2. Is a challenge to a bond conditioned on an impossible order cognizable in a pretrial writ and subject to interlocutory review?