

TEXAS COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

Sims, Gary Eugene v. The State of Texas

Sims v. State · No. 05-15-00685-CR · Decided August 13, 2015

SUMMARY

This document is a petition for discretionary review filed by Gary Eugene Sims in the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. It challenges the Fifth District Court of Appeals' dismissal of his appeal for want of jurisdiction following his conviction for aggravated sexual assault and life sentence. The petition asserts errors concerning jurisdiction, an evidentiary hearing, preservation of error, and the presentation of evidence.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Texas Court of Criminal Appeals
JURISDICTION	Texas
DECIDED	August 13, 2015
DOCKET	05-15-00685-CR
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for discretionary review challenging the Fifth Court of Appeals' dismissal of a criminal appeal for want of jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Abuse of discretion, as asserted in the petition regarding the court of appeals' dismissal for want of jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Not established from the provided document; the source is a petition for discretionary review rather than a court opinion.
PARTIES	Gary Eugene Sims v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- appellate jurisdiction
- preservation of error
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal appellate procedure
- criminal procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the Fifth Court of Appeals abused its discretion by dismissing Sims's appeal for want of jurisdiction.

2. Whether Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 44.10 required the appellate court to direct the trial court to correct a preserved, remediable error that prevented proper presentation of the case on appeal.
3. Whether the alleged trial-court errors were remediable without requiring an entirely new trial.

HOLDINGS

1. Under Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 44.10, when a trial-court action or failure to act prevents proper presentation of a case on appeal and the error can be remedied without requiring an entirely new trial, the appellate court must direct the trial court to correct the error.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A jury convicted Gary Eugene Sims of aggravated sexual assault and assessed punishment at life imprisonment. The petition alleges that trial-court errors prevented proper presentation of the case on appeal, including alleged failures involving evidentiary proceedings, findings, appointment or denial of counsel, constitutional rights, and discovery. The Fifth Court of Appeals dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury convicted Sims of aggravated sexual assault and assessed a life sentence. The Fifth Court of Appeals dismissed his appeal for want of jurisdiction. Sims filed this petition for discretionary review, arguing that the court of appeals abused its discretion and that the trial court committed remedial errors that prevented proper presentation of the case on appeal.

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. State, 23 S.W.3d 513 (Tex. Crim. App. 2000)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

/I/V, /0_?£*/S f^JO '«* RECEIVED COURTOF IN cmniHM.APPEAL -^ xv the Abe!Acosia,Cte* COURT OF CfUHnXUAL APPEALS PETTTXOM FDR DXSCRETXDJVARY fIEVXEW OF THE court of appeals fxfth d i s t r i c t o f texas Pit Dallas AID. 05-I5-OOG&5-C.R &fRV eu&ene Ex:ms~. Appbllmnt V. TriE STATE £>F TEXAS •, APPELLEE DA/ APPEAL FR0m.THE.aQ3i nd VUQXCXPiL DISTRICT COURT DALLAS CDUA/TI TEXfiS TRIAL C£>6tfT CAUSE y^F-0^W5^5<9j=j,£D|N COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS AUG 13 23;5 Abel Acosta, Clerk TABLE OF CONTENTS* TABLE OF CONTENTS X/VDEX OF AUTHORT.TTE£> STATEmFA/T OF THE C/4SE ,, / N&TUHE OF 1HB CASE. * ,,, \, ERRORS of court of APP&als Error(i), The. c&arF of appeals was in abuse. oP Oisc*rek\ov\ hy Df5ryifrr& appeal -For wan 4 of tfurtsciiGtiوي. w3-Y-5 Error &)/The courh ofi appv@te> waz> m ctbustL &p of sere Hon, gy rulfa e ihcu-f APf&uj \m*\$ untf/nely*, £> TKTKL COURT EKftDRS Error fix Tn'&L courF abuse 1+Discretion in not Holding £Vfdenifary Heahh-Bi. ^7 Error texsta-fc.

Procedural RUTE is Vh!^^ B Err©r &)* Oehic/I of fflrofarmehF &F ^oun^^i',— *! Error til* The
Ft-fFh ^m^yidm^eM RtehFrr*be Heard-l& ErrtrC5\ The SixFk ftm^n&m^+Ri<zhFc&rtfr~.,~io
Error(Q, ErAiiFlem-e,HT To Otscev&rYL jo 6REHEAKX/V£ EN&AjVCWHS DENIED
OA'.J'June^MS? CASES x JAfQEX OF AUTHORTTJrEZ, PA&E Thomas V.Skz-he aas.' sw*>d
^ihir^crim^pf^m}-^ EYPar^vittanueva^SasSwtes^i^ 3 EY Par+eMar&eM &l*j
swhd2&LCr^cri^JPP. mi) 4 ExPcfr^sR^r\ler\1V\ Sw^3H^(Te&trfm./W*tfef)- _ H EXp'Qrt&i
crozJ&xy *£wfi 5w&dJ\$z?l(r&t cfm.APf.wrtL _5 /^ayes V.S^k 53-gSvi/a*/
&27(T&,crim,/fr>fJ^7& £ Tbi/WServd V, Sa1 Y\ x373 U* 5,£?<93 (T/^63)_ _ _£
JJcWu^fl/5S.Cffi5l) _ _ _7 Hc»i.y. ®U5tSW tcf.2€?pB-- 7 Bl>ocK>77^/7 i/..scott aa,Fic/
shocuk cfirJwVL-Sl T(QiunSe,nd K S*tn\ 37a <y.3, 3*?3C/*te»- _7 wflfanis K Tavlör\ 52*1
o>3*3&A<:ao£?o)_ - 6 VLf F?^W/(shk'Ctra.a>IL jB Town^end V.s*uf/l^?>^a(/*5t£73^Q*::t65^
"6 Trevfn o v» Sk?h SLS SW9*d ^^^Cl^CftmJ^ff^._? ^trk/^/^ v- w**z,Hirt(=> u,^>*LL&Q^&l -3
ftfchorel&osi l/> wrfekFiHos USSae&CwrSii-- Jo ^odb^r® V.Kelly^,^7 xj.S <35^<T/*7 7£)___ /a
Q^\\S V. j4l,3QgCJ*17N2 Jo W^rd V>wkl4i^^UFI^teSS^l&&tf STATUTES J4A/J0
<ZWSTXTUTTD//S TEX.COAFST, art,V\ 3£jcfioy%& _ 5 Ar-K HH»B2 _ _ ' _ _ _ 5 U> S,
Coajst* Amend. fcv/^5 — 7 J 9 la.S, CQA/ST.Am-end* 6 _ - _ _ ' _ _ 9 U. 5.

C ^ S L ^ e i r i 5j£6l. _ _ J£> Art-* Ivs^oi-. /o_ _ _• _ <y RULES TEX. R. APP. P. 44.W >
(<«<&£-). _ _ J-3-5 //i TO THE MONOBRBL COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TEXMS I
Now comes The Defendant (MRYEUGEAfE SX/VIZ. in Thte Petition For Dbcr&tftonarv Review
of Tke 'Judstrt-ent cf the. Ft-Pth court of MPPejcils Dallas coujifyi lMa£> i which on
'3unedciAO)5. Dismissed Appeal Par wa/ih of Jurisdiction.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE A Jury convicted defendant of ae^ravaied sexual assault and
assessed jPu/Ushjntent ar CvnPfnerneMt for life.(fiRll 10Z-/03) * /VATUflE OF WE CASE The
dendoint 5o objection unde,r Texc*s Hale of appellate- FrocedirexHH.m (QXfk^i;That state's
Remediable. Error c£ the trialc&urtfa") Qenercrily h court of appeals Mush not otM-icmed or
reversed fod^rn&nt or dismiss omappe.al *I-Pn;jr> The trial court's erroneous acHo/7 or pe-Pusa)
1d £*cr- Prevents the.

PtoRerprescniaifon of a cas^c to the. ceourt oP appealsiaW Gft me ^r/-»/ cjaurF cam correct-its
action oR-fallure to act <cb)\ court of appeals directfmtf error rnedicibleJt the. cfrcumstances
described In ra\ exfst^the court- of- appeals rnustdfre.ct- tke trial court: to Correct the error.
AHQUME//T The court of appeals will th^ñ ProcceW as /V the erroneous c*dron of P&?)ure. to
a&+ h&d not occurrecf/sese.

Thoma&v.skv-fe £2.3 su/5d 5/3 (Tex, Cr\m. IApp. Zkoo-iY^iJnHw Fhfs, Rule\W a trial courtk
e^rror Prevents the Proper Presesnt>atfon of the case te> the aPP&liats court and tWat error c<cmi
he. nem-ed/ec/ without re^urfrvs cm enfre neto trio!, Ih^M the appellate Court /yiu^t clfrecF the.

tri<z*L *c<our-h to remedy the error s.o that the, C4PP€sil'04j-e court w/JI khe //? a position to evaluate thy*. &p#2.^/sy\o/perh/* We hrzAve ctpfied tkf£> rule, ho o trfej c&uHk r-e-ftj sal fc?

Permit a de4h^cicfnt /© /n&Jte -on oU^r oP- Proof* a trial c&ur+s faVure. -to conduct a Proper B^t^o^? he^r/ti^E?, z?/%^ -a tribal c&urtzi Pa//are h> tw&ki* fi/nd/k^^ £ n&GUjV^ hYlctfic/fz>snake ftule yy,Vv bv <€ia/f-/r&st, fs de<^fen&c/ to ePP^of the cresoth'ow oP & n&uu record)\when O tribal court has-erroneously withheld <l-ef-<w\<davth-s <s/<w*tf (dyj cwe^/fc.S. tenure to -Pile ne^ufr^d ffattott of-P&ot) or Kd5 r*neAseri+ed U*, dWWa«/ from » Submitting in-Porm^rhfori necessary te> evaluate his claim Ce. s, fiePus\v\<=/ to Permit^ Ov) afifier ©P Proof) \ the eipp-eil^liz jcx>urt is CdirecteAJto step fn and order the triad Court ta correct the situctttow'.The ker/ to RuJe-^rWvfs that there rwu^t be <ari error that the appe^ll-ate courtt cram, s o correct, find Afi the error in GuestTen i3 suhj&at to the usu^il rulers of Procedural default-, theyj At /nw&t have k&&r7Pfleserred by objection* EmoRS OF COURT OF APPEALS (l\ The Court of appeal5 was Ma abuse ofi Discretion by dismin^ the appeal-for want of 'Jurisdiction * The Court oP ol)6/se itk discracion in so dismiss s<&/&/ a/^e©/^rws^y- (oFVurisdietbn, Dependant appeals \as<uz.

Pursuant to, Jexp^, Pules, ol APPeA\33 J(cQa7 \ And HH*HfyYf)&< tfurisdiccton \ see^Xparted]laviueva^ttiSwzd^I ("m.Cr(m Corpus, Tbe^Sth Wstrict counFvHidalso counH sumariN denied the. sate application >6S befns fp ivo has. AppI lea nt <xppea\~ed.

The corPa schristi EAimhurs court cfi aPveats ^dismfeses th^e