

Dismissed and Opinion filed May 31, 2001.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-00-01486-CR

NO. 14-00-01487-CR

DONALD RAY JACKSON, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 263rd District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 858,570 & 858,571**

OPINION

Appellant pled guilty to the offenses of delivery of the controlled substance alprazolam and attempted delivery of the controlled substance hydrocodone. In accordance with the terms of a plea bargain agreement with the State, on October 18, 2000, the trial court sentenced appellant to confinement in a state jail for two years on each offense. Because we have no jurisdiction over these appeals, we dismiss.

Appellant filed a timely general notice of appeal that did not comply with the requirements of Rule 25.2(b)(3) of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See* TEX. R. APP.

P. 25.2(b)(3). Rule 25.2(b)(3) provides that when an appeal is from a judgment rendered on a defendant's plea of guilty or nolo contendere and the punishment assessed does not exceed the punishment recommended by the State and agreed to by the defendant, the notice of appeal must: (1) specify that the appeal is for a jurisdictional defect; (2) specify that the substance of the appeal was raised by written motion and ruled on before trial; or (3) state that the trial court granted permission to appeal. *Id.* Because the time for filing a proper notice of appeal has expired, appellant may not file an amended notice of appeal to correct jurisdictional defects. *State v. Riewe*, 13 S.W.3d408, 413-14 (Tex. Crim. App. 2000). Because appellant's notice of appeal did not comply with the requirements of Rule 25.2(b)(3), we are without jurisdiction to consider any of appellant's issues, including the voluntariness of the plea. *See Cooper v. State*, No. 1100-99, slip. op. at 8, 2001 WL 321579 at *1 (Tex. Crim. App. April 4, 2001) (holding that appellant who files general notice of appeal may not appeal voluntariness of negotiated plea).

The State moved to dismiss the appeals for want of jurisdiction. We grant the motion. Moreover, appellant has now filed a written motion to withdraw his notices of appeal, which we deem moot based upon our lack of jurisdiction.

Accordingly, we dismiss the appeals for want of jurisdiction.

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed May 31, 2001.

Panel consists of Justices Edelman and Frost and Senior Chief Justice Murphy.¹

Do Not Publish — TEX. R. APP. P. 47.3(b).

¹ Senior Chief Justice Paul C. Murphy sitting by assignment.