

COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, TENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT AT WACO

In re William Penn Dixon

No. 10-26-00131-CR (Tex. App.—Waco Apr. 23, 2026) · No. 10-26-00131-CR · Decided April 23, 2026

OPINION

In Re William Penn Dixon v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

Court of Appeals Tenth Appellate District of Texas 10-26-00131-CR In re William Penn Dixon
Original Proceeding JUSTICE SMITH delivered the opinion of the Court.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

William Penn Dixon, proceeding pro se, filed a document entitled “Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus” with this Court. He claims that the Brazos County District Clerk has refused to file his pro se petition for writ of habeas corpus and that the trial court has refused to hold a hearing on the petition, in which Dixon claims that the trial court should dismiss his pending criminal charges based on an illegal search. He asks that we “order the trial court to respond to the writ” and “send findings of facts [sic],” and further requests that we suppress the evidence and dismiss the charges. Intermediate appellate courts do not have original habeas corpus jurisdiction in criminal law matters. See TEX. GOV’T CODE ANN. § 22.221(d). Jurisdiction to grant a writ of habeas corpus in a criminal case vests with the Court of Criminal Appeals, the district courts, the county courts, or any judge in those courts. See TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. art. 11.05; Ex parte Braswell, 630 S.W.3d 600, 601-02 (Tex. App.—Waco 2021, orig. proceeding).¹ Accordingly, we dismiss Dixon’s petition for writ of habeas corpus for want of jurisdiction.

STEVE SMITH

Justice OPINION DELIVERED and FILED: April 23, 2026 Before Chief Justice Johnson, Justice Smith, and Justice Harris Dismissed Do not publish OT06 1 We note that Dixon also indicated in his petition that he is represented by court-appointed trial counsel and that appointed counsel refused to file a motion to suppress on his behalf. Though Dixon questions his appointed counsel’s qualifications, a defendant represented by counsel is not entitled to hybrid representation. See Robinson v. State, 240 S.W.3d 919, 922 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007). In re William Penn Dixon Page 2