

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT
AMARILLO

Celia Nicole Camacho v. the State of Texas

No. 07-24-00314-CR (Tex. App.—Amarillo Mar. 11, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. 07-24-00314-CR · Decided March 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The Seventh Court of Appeals of Texas affirmed the trial court’s adjudication of Celia Nicole Camacho’s guilt for injury to a child and twelve-year sentence after finding that she violated deferred-adjudication community supervision by committing theft. The court held that sufficient circumstantial evidence supported the theft violation and reformed the judgment to reflect that Camacho pleaded “Not True” to the motion to revoke.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lawrence M. Doss; Parker, C.J.; Doss, J.; Yarbrough, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
DECIDED	March 11, 2026
DOCKET	07-24-00314-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a judgment adjudicating appellant guilty of injury to a child after the trial court found that she violated deferred-adjudication community supervision by committing theft.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews an order revoking community supervision for abuse of discretion, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the trial court's ruling. The State must prove a community-supervision violation by a preponderance of the evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Celia Nicole Camacho v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- probation
- criminal procedure
- evidence
- appellate procedure
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

Criminal procedure

Community supervision

Theft

Appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether sufficient evidence supported the trial court's finding that Camacho violated the terms of deferred-adjudication community supervision by committing theft.
2. Whether the judgment should be reformed to state that Camacho pleaded not true, rather than true, to the motion to revoke.

HOLDINGS

1. The evidence was sufficient for the trial court to find by a preponderance of the evidence that Camacho committed theft and violated a condition of community supervision. The trial court therefore did not abuse its discretion in adjudicating her guilt.
2. The appellate court reformed the judgment to state that Camacho pleaded "Not True" to the motion to revoke and ordered the trial court to prepare and file a corrected judgment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A person need not physically move property to exercise control over it." (at 4)

"Nor does it depend on exclusive control." (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Camacho and her husband leased a house containing staging furniture from Chelsea Fhemister. After the Camachos failed to make agreed payments for certain furniture and were evicted, the furniture and a refrigerator were removed from the house and found at another residence rented by Camacho's husband. Camacho knew the property had been taken, stayed at the residence where it was found, kept clothing there, and appeared in photographs with the furniture, although she claimed she did not physically move the property and objected to taking it.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Camacho pleaded guilty to injury to a child in 2018 and received ten years of deferred-adjudication community supervision. The State moved to proceed with adjudication based on an alleged theft violation. After a revocation hearing, the trial court adjudicated Camacho guilty and sentenced her to twelve years' confinement. On appeal, she challenged the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the violation and asserted that the judgment incorrectly stated her plea to the motion to revoke. The court affirmed the judgment as reformed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The trial court must prepare and file a corrected judgment reflecting that Camacho pleaded "Not True" to the motion to revoke.

CASES CITED

- Hacker v. State, 389 S.W.3d 860, 865 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013)
- Rhomer v. State, 569 S.W.3d 664, 669 (Tex. Crim. App. 2019)
- Valderas v. State, Nos. 07-21-00111-CR, 07-21-00112-CR, 2022 Tex. App. LEXIS 5907, at *6-7 (Tex. App.—Amarillo Aug. 15, 2022, no pet.)
- Houston-Randle v. State, 499 S.W.3d 912, 914 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2016, pet. ref'd)
- Garrett v. State, 619 S.W.2d 172, 174 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1981)
- Temple v. State, 390 S.W.3d 341, 360 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013)
- Irish v. State, No. 13-19-00650-CR, 2021 Tex. App. LEXIS 5834, at *7 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi-Edinburg July 22, 2021, no pet.)
- Lucero v. State, No. 07-24-00171-CR, 2025 Tex. App. LEXIS 1121, at *6 (Tex. App.—Amarillo Feb. 24, 2025, no pet.)
- Joe v. State, 663 S.W.3d 728, 733 (Tex. Crim. App. 2022)
- De la Torre v. State, 583 S.W.3d 613, 619 (Tex. Crim. App. 2019)
- Weaver v. State, No. 07-06-00327-CR, 2007 Tex. App. LEXIS 2837, at *4-5 (Tex. App.—Amarillo Apr. 12, 2007, pet. ref'd) (mem. op., not designated for publication)
- Ramirez v. State, 336 S.W.3d 846, 852 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2011, pet. ref'd)
- Asberry v. State, 813 S.W.2d 526, 529 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1991, pet. ref'd)