

NO. _____
COURT APPEAL NO. 02-11-00335-CV

IN THE TEXAS
SUPREME COURT
AT AUSTIN, TEXAS

C.H.
Petitioner

VS.

THE STATE OF TEXAS
Respondent

PETITION FOR REVIEW
OF THE OPINION OF THE
SECOND COURT OF APPEALS OF
THE STATE OF TEXAS

BLAKE R. BURNS
115 North Henderson Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-1940
(817) 870-1544 FAX 870-1589
State Bar No. 24066989

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT:

COMES NOW, **C.H.**, Petitioner and files this his
Petition for Discretionary Review of the decision of the
Second Court of Appeals.

LIST OF INTERESTED PARTIES

JUDGES :

The Honorable Judge Jean Boyd
323rd Criminal District Court of Tarrant County, Texas

TRIAL COUNSEL:

The Honorable Ronald Huseman, Counsel for the State
State Bar No. 24036816
2701 Kimbo Rd.
Fort Worth, Texas 76111

The Honorable Vicky Foster, Counsel for the State
State Bar No. 07308170
2701 Kimbo Rd.
Fort Worth, Texas 76111

The Honorable Candace Taylor
State Bar No. 00797542
902 S. Jennings
Ft. Worth, Texas 76104

The Honorable Felipe Calzada
Counsel for Respondent
State Bar No. 24003592
2724 Kimbo Rd.
Fort Worth, Texas 76111

APPELLATE COUNSEL:

Blake R. Burns, Appellate Counsel for Defense
115 North Henderson Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

STATEMENT REGARDING ORAL ARGUMENT

Appellant does not request oral argument.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF INTERESTED PARTIES.....ii

STATEMENT REGARDING ORAL ARGUMENT.....ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....iii

TABLE OF CASES AND AUTHORITIES.....v

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....1

STATEMENT OF FACTS.....2

PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....3

ISSUES PRESENTED.....3

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....4

REASON FOR REVIEW NUMBER ONE.....6

THE COURT OF APPEALS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF STATE OR FEDERAL LAW THAT HAS NOT BEEN, BUT SHOULD BE, SETTLED BY THE SUPREME COURT WHEN IT HELD THAT JURY QUESTIONNAIRES ARE NOT PART OF THE RECORD ON APPEAL.

REASON FOR REVIEW NUMBER TWO.....12

THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED WHEN IT HELD THAT APPELLANT DID NOT REQUEST A COPY OF AN INTERVIEW TAPE WITHHELD FROM APPELLANT IN VIOLATION OF *BRADY*.

REASON FOR REVIEW NUMBER THREE.....19

THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION ERRED
WHEN IT HELD THAT APPELLANT DID
NOT SUFFER HARM FROM THE TRIAL COURT'S
FAILURE TO INCLUDE A SELF DEFENSE
INSTRUCTION IN THE APPLICATION PARAGRAPH
OF THE JURY CHARGE.

CONCLUSION AND PRAYER.....23

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....24

APPENDIX.....25

JUDGMENT.....27

COURT'S CHARGE ON ADJUDICATION.....33

COURT'S CHARGE ON DISPOSITION.....42

OPINION.....47

TABLE OF CASES AND AUTHORITIES

Cases :	Page
<i>Copley Press, Inc. v. Superior Court</i> , 278 Cal. Rptr. 443 (Cal. Ct. App. 1991) . . .	8
<i>Forum Commc'ns Co. v. Paulson</i> , 752 N.W.2d 177 (N.D. 2008)	8
<i>Holmes v. South Carolina</i> , 547 U.S. 319 (2006)	13, 15
<i>Hutch v. State</i> , 922 S.W.2d 166 (Tex.Crim.App. 1996)	20
<i>In re L.D.C.</i> , 400 S.W.3d 572, 574–75(Tex. 2013)	7
<i>In re Newsday, Inc. v. Goodman</i> , 552 N.Y.S.2d 965 (N.Y. App. Div. 1990)	8
<i>In re South Carolina Press Ass'n</i> , 946 F.2d 1037 (4th Cir. 1991)	7
<i>Kyles v. Whitley</i> , 514 U.S. 419 (1995)	12
<i>Malik v. State</i> , 953 S.W.2d 234 (1997)	20
<i>Plata v. State</i> , 926 S.W.2d 300 (Tex.Crim.App. 1996)	20
<i>Press–Enterprise Co. v. Superior Court</i> , 464 U.S. 501 (1984)	8
<i>State ex rel. Beacon Journal Publ'g Co. v. Bond</i> , 781 N.E.2d 180 (Ohio 2002) . .	8
<i>Stephens Media, LLC v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court</i> , 221 P.3d 1240 (Nev. 2009).8	8
<i>United States v. Bagley</i> , 473 U.S. 667 (1985)	12
<i>United States v. McDade</i> , 929 F.Supp. 815 (E.D.Pa. 1996)	7
<i>Vega v. State</i> , 394 S.W.3d 514 (Tex.Crim.App. 2013)	19

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.