

Dismissed and Opinion filed October 12, 2000.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NOS. 14-00-00558-CR; 14-00-00559-CR

DANIEL KEITH HARRISON, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 178th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 833064; 833063**

OPINION

Appellant entered a plea of guilty to aggravated sexual assault of a child in two causes pursuant to a plea agreement. The trial court accepted his plea in each cause, found the evidence sufficient to substantiate his guilt, and assessed punishment, in accordance with each plea agreement, at twenty year's confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. In four points of error, appellant contends the trial court committed reversible error by depriving him of the right to compulsory process under the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution and the Due Course of Law provision in the Texas Constitution. We dismiss for want of jurisdiction.

To invoke the appellate jurisdiction of this court over an appeal from a judgment entered on a negotiated plea of guilty, appellant must file a specific notice of appeal complying with the extra notice requirements of rule 25.2(b)(3) of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See Manuel v. State*, 994 S.W.2d 658, 661-62 (Tex. Crim. App. 1999). Rule 25.2(b)(3) requires that the notice of appeal state the following: (1) the appeal is for a jurisdictional defect; (2) the substance of the appeal was raised by written motion and ruled on before trial; or (3) the trial court granted appellant permission to appeal. TEX. R. APP. P. 25.2(b)(3).

In both causes, appellant filed a general notice of appeal alleging that his plea was involuntary, “induced by ineffective assistance of counsel.” A general notice of appeal does not comply with the requirements of rule 25.2(b)(3). Nevertheless, a general notice of appeal is sufficient to invoke appellate jurisdiction to consider the voluntariness of a negotiated plea. *See Moore v. State*, 4 S.W.3d 269, 271 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1999, no pet.). Appellant, however, does not assert on appeal that his plea was involuntary. Instead, appellant alleges trial error in the denial of his right to compulsory process under the state and federal constitutions. Because appellant’s general notice of appeal does not invoke the jurisdiction of this court to consider the issues he now raises on appeal, we must dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction. *See Slaton v. State*, 981 S.W.2d 208, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 1998).

Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction.

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed October 12, 2000.

Panel consists of Justices Yates, Wittig, and Frost.

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