

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT BEAUMONT

Ronald D. Babino v. The State of Texas

No. 09-24-00154-CR · No. No. 09-24-00154-CR · Decided February 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ninth Court of Appeals of Texas affirmed Ronald D. Babino’s murder conviction and twenty-two-year sentence. The court held that the evidence was legally sufficient to establish Babino’s criminal responsibility as a party or co-conspirator in an aggravated robbery during which the victim was killed. The court overruled Babino’s sufficiency challenge and affirmed the trial court’s judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Kent Chambers; Golemon, C.J.; Wright, J.; Chambers, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
DECIDED	February 4, 2026
DOCKET	No. 09-24-00154-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Babino appealed his jury conviction for murder, arguing that the evidence was legally insufficient to support the verdict.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the evidence for legal sufficiency under the hypothetically correct jury charge, viewing all evidence and reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the verdict. The conviction was upheld if any rational trier of fact could have found each essential element beyond a reasonable doubt. The court did not reweigh evidence, assess witness credibility, or substitute its judgment for the jury's.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential memorandum opinion; marked Do Not Publish.
PARTIES	Ronald D. Babino v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- evidence
- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure
- standard of review
- conspiracy

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether legally sufficient evidence supported Babino's murder conviction under the law of parties and co-conspirator liability.

HOLDINGS

1. The evidence was legally sufficient to support the murder conviction because a rational jury could find beyond a reasonable doubt that Babino intended to promote or assist an aggravated robbery, aided Johnson and Freeman, and that the murder committed in furtherance of the robbery was a result he should have anticipated.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Each fact need not point directly and independently to a defendant’s guilt, as long as the cumulative force of all the incriminating circumstances is sufficient to support the conviction.” (14)

“Even if Babino did not intend for Johnson or Freeman to shoot Shillow during the robbery, a reasonable jury could have concluded that Babino should have anticipated that a murder was possible.” (18)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The evidence showed that Richard Shillow was shot and killed at an apartment complex during an apparent planned robbery. Surveillance video and witness testimony placed Babino as the driver of a gray or silver Infiniti that brought Kaylon Johnson and Joseph Freeman to Shillow, waited nearby, and picked them up immediately after the shooting. Babino later admitted that he was looking to make money by getting a "lick," which investigators interpreted as committing a robbery, and evidence linked a gun found in a stolen vehicle associated with Babino to the caliber of casings found at the murder scene.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury convicted Babino of murder and sentenced him to twenty-two years' incarceration in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. The appeal was taken from the judgment of the 252nd District Court of Jefferson County, Texas. The Ninth District Court of Appeals overruled Babino's sufficiency challenge and affirmed the judgment.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Metcalf v. State, 597 S.W.3d 847, 855 (Tex. Crim. App. 2020)
- Hooper v. State, 214 S.W.3d 9, 13, 16 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007)
- Malik v. State, 953 S.W.2d 234, 240 (Tex. Crim. App. 1997)

- Williams v. State, 235 S.W.3d 742, 750 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007)
- Jackson v. Virginia, 443 U.S. 307, 318-19 (1979)
- Balderas v. State, 517 S.W.3d 756, 766 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016)
- Garcia v. State, 667 S.W.3d 756, 761-62 (Tex. Crim. App. 2023)
- Schroeder v. State, 123 S.W.3d 398, 400 (Tex. Crim. App. 2003)
- Adames v. State, 353 S.W.3d 854, 862 (Tex. Crim. App. 2011)
- Salinas v. State, 163 S.W.3d 734, 739-40 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005)
- Ransom v. State, 920 S.W.2d 288, 302 (Tex. Crim. App. 1994)
- Anderson v. State, 416 S.W.3d 884, 889 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013)
- Ervin v. State, 333 S.W.3d 187, 201 (Tex. App.—Houston 2010, pet. ref'd)
- Yancy v. State, No. 03-23-00251-CR, 2025 Tex. App. LEXIS 6222, at *17 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 15, 2025, no pet.)
- Dale v. State, No. 05-24-00742-CR, 2025 Tex. App. LEXIS 4011, at *8 (Tex. App.—Dallas June 11, 2025, no pet.)