

FOURTH COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

Deveon Jeffrey Taylor-White v. The State of Texas

Taylor-White v. State · No. 04-25-00077-CR · Decided February 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The Fourth Court of Appeals of San Antonio affirmed Deveon Jeffrey Taylor-White’s murder conviction and forty-year sentence. The court held that the evidence was sufficient to establish his liability under the law of parties and that the trial court did not violate due process by failing to consider the full range of punishment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Fourth Court of Appeals of Texas at San Antonio
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Rebeca C. Martinez, Chief Justice; Irene Rios, Justice; Lori I. Valenzuela, Justice
JURISDICTION	Fourth Court of Appeals, San Antonio, Texas
DECIDED	February 25, 2026
DOCKET	04-25-00077-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Taylor-White appealed his jury conviction for murder and forty-year prison sentence, challenging the sufficiency of the evidence supporting party liability and the trial court's consideration of the full range of punishment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the sufficiency of the evidence in the light most favorable to the verdict to determine whether a rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. It reviewed the due-process sentencing claim under the presumption that the trial court was neutral and detached absent a clear showing to the contrary.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Deveon Jeffrey Taylor-White v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- criminal procedure
- standard of review
- burden of proof
- due process
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law

criminal procedure

appellate litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the evidence was legally sufficient to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Taylor-White acted with the intent to promote or assist Randle's commission of the murder under the law of parties.
2. Whether the trial court violated due process by failing to consider the full range of punishment before imposing sentence.

HOLDINGS

1. The evidence was legally sufficient for a rational jury to find that Taylor-White intended to promote or assist Randle in committing the murder.
2. The trial court did not violate due process because the record did not show that it arbitrarily refused to consider the full range of punishment or imposed a predetermined sentence.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Plea bargains are just what they’re called. They’re bargains. What happens is generally the State looks at a case, sees what it’s worth, and offers something considerably less, generally anywhere from a third to a half of what the person actually deserves for the commission.” (at 7)

“The comments made by the trial court do not demonstrate that it refused to consider the full range of punishment, but rather, made an “attempt to assess a sentence proportionate to the seriousness of [Taylor-White’s] crime.”” (at 8)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Taylor-White was present when Michael Randle shot Daniel Murphy in an apartment. Evidence showed that Taylor-White and Randle followed Murphy into the apartment, questioned him about another man's whereabouts and property, and that Taylor-White gave commands interpreted by the court as directing Randle to shoot Murphy. Randle fired multiple shots, and Taylor-White grabbed Randle's arm as they fled. The jury convicted Taylor-White under the law of parties, and the trial court imposed a forty-year sentence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury found Taylor-White guilty of murder under the law of parties. The trial court assessed punishment at forty years in prison after considering trial evidence and a presentence investigation report. Taylor-White appealed, and the Fourth Court of Appeals affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Jackson v. Virginia, 443 U.S. 307, 319 (1979)
- Gutierrez v. State, 668 S.W.3d 46, 49 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2022, pet. ref'd)
- Hammack v. State, 622 S.W.3d 910, 914 (Tex. Crim. App. 2021)
- Isassi v. State, 330 S.W.3d 633, 638 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010)
- Laster v. State, 275 S.W.3d 512, 518, 524 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009)
- Gross v. State, 380 S.W.3d 181, 186 (Tex. Crim. App. 2012)
- Rodriguez v. State, 521 S.W.3d 822, 828 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2017, no pet.)
- Wygal v. State, 555 S.W.2d 465, 468-69 (Tex. Crim. App. 1977)
- Metcalf v. State, 597 S.W.3d 847, 856 (Tex. Crim. App. 2020)
- Hall v. State, 418 S.W.2d 810, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. 1967)
- Brown v. State, 122 S.W.3d 794, 800 (Tex. Crim. App. 2003)
- Brooks v. State, 323 S.W.3d 893, 899 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010)
- Alphin v. State, No. 06-11-00257-CR, 2012 WL 6060764, at *4 (Tex. App.—Texarkana Dec. 6, 2012, no pet.)
- Garcia v. State, 486 S.W.3d 602 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2015, pet. ref'd)
- Brumit v. State, 206 S.W.3d 639, 645 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006)
- Gagnon v. Scarpelli, 411 U.S. 778, 786 (1973)
- Buerger v. State, 60 S.W.3d 358, 364 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2001, pet. ref'd)
- Salinas v. State, 9 S.W.3d 338, 340 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1999, no pet.)
- Gonzalez v. State, No. 01-14-00861-CR, 2015 WL 9310903, at *2 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Dec. 22, 2015, no pet.)
- Evans v. State, 656 S.W.2d 65, 67 (Tex. Crim. App. 1983)
- Jaenicke v. State, 109 S.W.3d 793, 797 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2003, pet. ref'd)
- Meighen v. State, No. 11-11-00259-CR, 2012 WL 3799664, at *1, *4 (Tex. App.—Eastland Aug. 31, 2012, pet. ref'd)