

TEXAS COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

Sandbloom, Stephen Jay

No. 1757517, Texas Court of Criminal Appeals (May 7, 2015)

SUMMARY

This document is a supplemental letter and declaration by Stephen Jay Sandbloom responding to the State's findings of fact, conclusions of law, recommendation, and order in a Texas criminal post-conviction matter. It disputes the State's account of plea-bargain and pretrial proceedings, requests an evidentiary hearing, and seeks production of court reporter records concerning several hearings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Texas Court of Criminal Appeals
JURISDICTION	Texas
DECIDED	May 7, 2015
DOCKET	1757517
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Supplemental answers by a state post-conviction applicant responding to the State's findings of fact, conclusions of law, recommendation, and order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	none apparent; supplied document is a party filing rather than a judicial opinion
PARTIES	Stephen Jay Sandbloom v. State of Texas

TOPICS

state post-conviction relief speedy trial plea bargaining appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

state post-conviction relief criminal procedure appellate procedure

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Sandbloom asserted that he accepted a twenty-year plea offer on April 7, 2011, and that documents were signed by him, his attorney Ira Perz, and prosecutor Robert Yack, although the plea was not taken by the court at that time. He disputed the State's characterization of the offer as nonbinding and challenged the State's account of hearings held on November 18, 2011, and during the first day of trial on December 5, 2011. He claimed that

reporter's records for several pretrial dates were unavailable and requested an evidentiary hearing and an order requiring the records to be located.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The supplied document is a supplemental letter submitted by Stephen Jay Sandbloom in a post-conviction proceeding. Sandbloom disputed the State's account of hearings concerning a plea-bargain enforcement motion and a speedy-trial motion, asserted that relevant court-reporter records were missing, and requested an evidentiary hearing and production of those records. The document does not state a ruling or disposition by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals.