

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| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | nonprecedential                                                                                                                                   |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