

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT BEAUMONT

Gary Holland v. The State of Texas

Holland · No. Nos. 09-25-00516-CR, 09-25-00517-CR · Decided February 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ninth Court of Appeals of Texas dismissed Gary Holland's interlocutory appeals because neither appeal arose from a final judgment or an appealable order. The court held that it lacked jurisdiction absent a statute authorizing an interlocutory appeal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Golemon, C.J.; Johnson, J.; Chambers, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
DECIDED	February 11, 2026
DOCKET	Nos. 09-25-00516-CR, 09-25-00517-CR
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Holland filed interlocutory notices of appeal from rulings in two criminal trial causes. The court of appeals dismissed both appeals for lack of appellate jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Gary Holland v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate jurisdiction
- interlocutory appeal
- final judgment rule
- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Texas criminal appellate procedure
- appellate jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court of appeals had jurisdiction to review Holland's interlocutory criminal appeals before a final judgment or sentence.
- Whether either challenged trial-court ruling qualified as a statutorily authorized interlocutory appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. The court of appeals lacked jurisdiction because Holland sought review of interlocutory orders before a final conviction, sentence, or other appealable order.
2. Holland did not establish that either interlocutory order was expressly appealable by statute.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A court of appeals lacks appellate jurisdiction to review an order before final judgment unless an interlocutory appeal is expressly provided by statute.” (at 2)

“Accordingly, we dismiss the appeals for lack of jurisdiction.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Gary Holland sought appellate relief from alleged unauthorized entry of a plea and interlocutory orders or rulings issued in two criminal trial causes. He admitted that the orders he sought to appeal were interlocutory. Neither party demonstrated that the trial court had imposed a sentence in open court or signed an order appealable at that time.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The appeals arose from Montgomery County trial causes 25-397809 and 25-397810 in the County Court at Law No. 5. After the clerk notified the parties that the challenged orders appeared neither final nor appealable, Holland acknowledged that he was appealing interlocutory orders and argued that the trial court had acted without authority. The court dismissed the appeals because no final judgment, sentence, or statutorily appealable interlocutory order had been shown.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Abbott v. State, 271 S.W.3d 694, 697 n.8 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008)
- Ragston v. State, 424 S.W.3d 49, 52 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014)