

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT
AMARILLO

Renaldo Martinez v. The State of Texas

Nos. 07-26-00076-CR, 07-26-00077-CR, 07-26-00078-CR · No. Nos. 07-26-00076-CR, 07-26-00077-CR, 07-26-00078-CR · Decided February 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas dismissed Renaldo Martinez’s appeals from three driving-while-intoxicated convictions. The court concluded that the trial court’s certifications reflected plea-bargain cases in which Martinez had no right of appeal and had waived that right, and that dismissal was required under Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 25.2(d).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Parker, C.J.; Doss, J.; Yarbrough, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
DECIDED	February 27, 2026
DOCKET	Nos. 07-26-00076-CR, 07-26-00077-CR, 07-26-00078-CR
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appellant challenged three driving-while-intoxicated convictions and concurrent county-jail sentences in appeals arising from plea-bargain cases.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Renaldo Martinez v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- appellate jurisdiction
- plea bargaining
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal law
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court of appeals was required to dismiss the appeals because the trial court certifications did not show that Martinez had a right of appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. The court was required to dismiss the appeals because the trial court certifications, which comported with the record, showed that the cases were plea-bargain cases in which Martinez had no right of appeal and had waived the right of appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We are required by Rule of Appellate Procedure 25.2(d) to dismiss an appeal “if a certification that shows the defendant has the right of appeal has not been made part of the record.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Martinez was convicted in three cases of driving while intoxicated under Texas Penal Code section 49.04. The trial court imposed concurrent sentences of 300 days in county jail. The trial court's certifications stated that the convictions resulted from plea bargains, that Martinez had no right of appeal, and that he had waived any right of appeal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The County Court at Law No. 2 of Potter County entered three convictions and concurrent sentences of 300 days in county jail. The trial court certified that the cases were plea-bargain cases in which Martinez had no right of appeal and had waived the right of appeal. The court of appeals notified Martinez of the certifications and afforded him an opportunity to show grounds for continuing the appeals, but he did not respond. The court dismissed all three appeals.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

OPINION

Renaldo Martinez v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

In The Court of Appeals Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo No. 07-26-00076-CR No. 07-26-00077-CR No. 07-26-00078-CR

RENALDO MARTINEZ, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 2 Potter County, Texas Trial Court Nos. CCCR-25-331-2, CCCR-25-799-2 & CCCR-25-729-2 Honorable Walton Weaver, Sitting by Assignment
February 27, 2026

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before PARKER, C.J., and DOSS and YARBROUGH, JJ. Appellant, Renaldo Martinez, appeals his three convictions for driving while intoxicated, 1 and concurrent sentences to three hundred days of confinement in county jail. The trial court's certifications of Appellant's right of appeal reflect that these are plea bargain cases from which Appellant has no right of appeal and that Appellant has waived 1 See TEX. PENAL CODE § 49.04. the right of appeal. The certifications comport with the record before the Court. Notwithstanding the certifications, Appellant filed these appeals challenging his convictions. We are required by Rule of Appellate Procedure 25.2(d) to dismiss an appeal "if a certification that shows the defendant has the right of appeal has not been made part of the record." By letter of February 5, 2026, we notified Appellant of the consequences of the trial court's certifications and directed him to show grounds for continuing the appeals by February 17, 2026. Appellant has not filed a response or had any further communication with the Court to date. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeals based on the trial court's certifications. See TEX. R. APP. P. 25.2(d). Per Curiam Do not publish. 2