

**COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AT FORT WORTH**

Cameron Marquette Lewis v. the State of Texas

No. 02-25-00454-CR · No. No. 02-25-00454-CR · Decided January 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The Second Court of Appeals of Texas dismissed Cameron Marquette Lewis’s appeal from a driving-while-intoxicated conviction for want of jurisdiction. The court held that Lewis’s notice of appeal and motion for extension were untimely, and noted that the plea-bargain case independently lacked appellate jurisdiction under Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 25.2(d).

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In the Court of Appeals Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth

No. 02-25-00454-CR _____

CAMERON MARQUETTE LEWIS, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS On Appeal from County Criminal Court No. 9 Tarrant County, Texas Trial Court No. 1844584 Before Sudderth, C.J.; Kerr and Walker, JJ. Memorandum Opinion by Justice Walker MEMORANDUM OPINION Appellant Cameron Marquette Lewis, acting pro se, attempts to appeal his conviction for driving while intoxicated.

See Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 49.04. Pursuant to a plea bargain, Lewis’s sentence was imposed on May 16, 2025. He did not file a motion for new trial, making his notice of appeal due by June 16, 2025. See Tex. R. App. P. 26.2(a) (requiring that a notice of appeal be filed within 30 days after the sentence is imposed or 90 days after the sentence is imposed if the defendant files a motion for new trial).

However, Lewis did not file his notice of appeal until December 2, 2025, making it untimely. See Tex. R. App. P. 26.2(a)(1). On December 3, 2025, we notified Lewis by letter of our concern that we lack jurisdiction over this appeal because his notice of appeal was untimely.

We informed him that unless he filed a response by December 15, 2025, showing grounds for continuing the appeal, the appeal would be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 44.3. In response, Lewis filed a motion for extension, see Tex. R. App. P. 26.3 (permitting an appellate court to extend the time to file a notice of appeal if, within 15 days after the deadline for filing the notice of appeal, the party files the notice of appeal in the trial court and an extension

motion in the appellate court), but his extension motion was likewise untimely and did not cure the untimeliness of his notice of appeal, see Tex. R. App.

P. 26.2(a)(1). Because Lewis’s appeal was untimely, and because a timely notice of appeal is an essential component of our jurisdiction, we dismiss this appeal for want of 2 jurisdiction.¹ See Tex. R. App. P. 26.2(a), 43.2(f); *Slaton v. State*, 981 S.W.2d 208, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 1998). /s/ Brian Walker Brian Walker Justice Do Not Publish Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b) Delivered: January 15, 2026 ¹ Even if Lewis’s notice of appeal had been timely, we still would not have jurisdiction over this appeal because he entered into a plea bargain with the State.

See Tex. R. App. P. 25.2(d). The signed plea admonishments memorialize the plea bargain, and trial court’s certification states that this “is a plea-bargain case, and the defendant has NO right of appeal.” ³