

COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, THIRTEENTH DISTRICT, CORPUS
CHRISTI–EDINBURG

Damien Renwick Jones v. the State of Texas

No. 13-24-00236-CR · No. 13-24-00236-CR · Decided April 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The Thirteenth Court of Appeals of Texas affirmed Damien Renwick Jones’s conviction for possession of methamphetamine with intent to deliver and his seventy-five-year sentence. The court held that the suppression issue was moot because the challenged evidence was not introduced at trial, the continuance issue was not preserved and no continuance was denied, and the evidence was sufficient to establish knowing possession and intent to deliver.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Texas, Thirteenth District, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
WRITING FOR THE COURT	L. Aron Peña Jr.; Justice Silva; Justice Peña; Justice Fonseca
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Texas, Thirteenth District, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
DECIDED	April 30, 2026
DOCKET	13-24-00236-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a judgment of conviction following a jury trial for possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Suppression rulings are reviewed under a bifurcated standard, with almost total deference to historical fact findings and credibility-based mixed questions of law and fact, and review of legal questions de novo. The denial of a continuance is reviewed for abuse of discretion. Evidentiary sufficiency is reviewed under Jackson v. Virginia, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the verdict and asking whether a rational juror could have found the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished memorandum opinion; not designated for publication.
PARTIES	Damien Renwick Jones v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

suppression of evidence

criminal procedure

preservation of error

evidence

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Texas criminal law

criminal procedure

appellate practice

controlled substances

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court erred in denying Jones's motion to suppress when the challenged evidence was not introduced or admitted at trial.
2. Whether the trial court erred in denying a motion for continuance based on the State's late production of a jail-call recording and transcript.
3. Whether the evidence was legally sufficient to prove that Jones knowingly possessed at least four grams of methamphetamine with intent to deliver.

HOLDINGS

1. The suppression issue was moot because the record did not show that the evidence challenged by the motion was offered or admitted at trial; Jones therefore could not show harm from any alleged error.
2. Jones failed to preserve the continuance issue because he did not make a proper request for a continuance or obtain a ruling on one, and the record showed that the trial court granted his request for one hour to review the late-produced material.
3. The evidence was sufficient for a rational jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Jones knowingly possessed at least four grams of methamphetamine and intended to deliver it.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We find that appellant cannot show he was harmed by any error. Thus, the issue is moot." (5)

"Not only has appellant failed to preserve the issue for appellate review, there is no indication that a request for continuance was denied." (6)

"After examining the evidence in light most favorable to the verdict, we find that a jury could reasonably conclude that appellant's connection to the contraband was more than just fortuitous and the logical force of the factors could lead them to determine that the elements of the indicted offense were established beyond a reasonable doubt." (10)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Police investigated anonymous reports of drug dealing at a residence and learned that Jones had an active arrest warrant and a history of narcotics-related activity. Officers stopped Jones on Avenue F, also known as Highway 60, to execute the warrant; Jones resisted the officers and was taken to the ground. After Jones was detained, officers found a black bag containing approximately 32.66 grams of methamphetamine and other baggies near the patrol car where the struggle began. Testimony indicated that the quantity was consistent with distribution rather than personal use.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jones was indicted in the 130th District Court of Matagorda County for possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, with two felony enhancement paragraphs. Following a jury trial, he was found guilty and sentenced to seventy-five years' imprisonment. The court of appeals considered challenges to the denial of a motion to suppress, the denial of a continuance, and the sufficiency of the evidence, and affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Martinez, 570 S.W.3d 278, 281 (Tex. Crim. App. 2019)
- Valtierra v. State, 310 S.W.3d 442, 447 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010)
- Abney v. State, 394 S.W.3d 542, 547 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013)
- State v. Woodard, 341 S.W.3d 404, 410 (Tex. Crim. App. 2011)
- Young v. State, 283 S.W.3d 854, 873 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009)
- Long v. State, 525 S.W.3d 351, 368 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2017)
- Gonzalez v. State, 296 S.W.3d 620, 633 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2009, pet. ref'd)
- Brumfield v. State, 641 S.W.3d 568, 580 (Tex. App.—Tyler 2022, pet. ref'd)
- Anderson v. State, 301 S.W.3d 276, 278-80 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009)
- Garza v. State, 126 S.W.3d 79, 81-82 (Tex. Crim. App. 2004)
- Blackshear v. State, 385 S.W.3d 589, 591 (Tex. Crim. App. 2012)
- Edward v. State, 635 S.W.3d 649, 655 (Tex. Crim. App. 2021)
- Jackson v. Virginia, 443 U.S. 307, 318-19 (1979)
- Isassi v. State, 330 S.W.3d 633, 638 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010)
- Villarreal v. State, 286 S.W.3d 321, 327 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009)
- Malik v. State, 953 S.W.2d 234, 240 (Tex. Crim. App. 1997)
- Espino-Cruz v. State, 586 S.W.3d 538, 543 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2019, pet. ref'd)
- Romero v. State, No. 13-20-00103-CR, 2021 WL 1045804, at *4 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg Mar. 18, 2021, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication)
- Evans v. State, 202 S.W.3d 158, 161-64 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006)
- Barbosa v. State, 537 S.W.3d 640, 645 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2017, no pet.)
- Brown v. State, 911 S.W.2d 744, 747 (Tex. Crim. App. 1995) (en banc)
- Tate v. State, 500 S.W.3d 410, 413-14 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016)
- Huan Phuoc Le v. State, 479 S.W.3d 462, 467 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015, no pet.)
- Jenkins v. State, 76 S.W.3d 709, 711-12 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg 2002, pet. ref'd)
- King v. State, 895 S.W.2d 701, 703 (Tex. Crim. App. 1995)
- Jones v. State, 963 S.W.2d 830

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/court-of-appeals-of-texas-thirteenth-district-corpus-christi-edinburg-court-of-appeals-of-texas-thir/2026/damien-renwick-jones-v-the-state-of-texas-vhuoozdv>