

NO. 000000

STATE OF TEXAS) IN THE COUNTY COURT
VS.) AT LAW NUMBER FIVE
JOE SMITH) BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE INFORMATION

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Joe Smith moves that the information filed in this case be set aside by virtue of the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, Article I §§ 10 and 19 of the Texas Constitution, and Articles 1.05, 21.01, 21.02, 21.03, 21.04, and 21.11 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure for the following reasons:

I.

The information is defective because it alleges that Mr. Smith did “operate” a gambling place, but does not allege the manner and means by which this purported operation took place. *See Miller v. State*, 647 S.W. 2d 266, 267 (Tex. Crim. App. 1983)(indictment for criminal mischief must allege the manner and means by which defendant damaged and destroyed the property); *see also Castillo v. State*, 689 S.W. 2d 443, 449 (Tex. Crim. App. 1984)(indictment for arson must allege manner and means in which defendant started the fire) ; *Smith v. State*, 658 S.W. 2d 172, 173 (Tex. Crim. App. 1983)(indictment for gambling promotion must state manner and means by which defendant received bets and offers to bet); *Cruise v. State*, 587 S.W. 2d 403, 405 (Tex. Crim. App. 1979)(indictment for aggravated robbery must allege manner and means

whereby defendant allegedly caused bodily injury); *Haecker v. State*, 571 S.W. 2d 920, 922 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978)(information for animal cruelty must allege manner and means by which defendant tortured the animal).

II.

The information is defective because it alleges that Mr. Smith did "participate in the earnings of a gambling place," but does not allege the manner and means by which this purported participation took place. *See Miller v. State*, 647 S.W. 2d 266, 267 (Tex. Crim. App. 1983)(indictment for criminal mischief must allege the manner and means by which defendant damaged and destroyed the property); *see also Castillo v. State*, 689 S.W. 2d 443, 449 (Tex. Crim. App. 1984)(indictment for arson must allege manner and means in which defendant started the fire) ; *Smith v. State*, 658 S.W. 2d 172, 173 (Tex. Crim. App. 1983)(indictment for gambling promotion must state manner and means by which defendant received bets and offers to bet); *Cruise v. State*, 587 S.W. 2d 403, 405 (Tex. Crim. App. 1979)(indictment for aggravated robbery must allege manner and means whereby defendant allegedly caused bodily injury); *Haecker v. State*, 571 S.W. 2d 920, 922 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978)(information for animal cruelty must allege manner and means by which defendant tortured the animal).

III.

The allegations that Mr. Smith did "operate and participate in the earnings of a gambling place" are vague, and fail to give a person of ordinary intelligence fair notice of what he must defend himself against, in violation of the Due Process Clause of the

Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the Due Course of Law provision of Article I, §§ 13 and 19 of the Texas Constitution, as well as article 21.11 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure. Nor could Mr. Smith plead a judgment based upon this information in bar of a subsequent prosecution, in violation of the Due Course of Law provision of Article I, §§ 13 and 19 of the Texas Constitution, as well as article and 21.04 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure.

IV.

The information is defective because it alleges two separate offenses -- namely that Mr. Smith operated a gambling place, and that he participated in the earnings of a gambling place -- in a single paragraph, in violation of article 21.24(b) of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure.

V.

The information alleges Mr. Smith's involvement with a "gambling place," but it does not define that phrase, even though it has multiple definitions under the Texas Penal Code. *See* TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 47.01(3).

VI.

The information alleges that Mr. Smith removed the earnings from an eight liner machine, but does not allege the manner and means by which he did so. *See Miller v. State*, 647 S.W. 2d 266, 267 (Tex. Crim. App. 1983)(indictment for criminal mischief must allege the manner and means by which defendant damaged and destroyed the property); *see also Castillo v. State*, 689 S.W. 2d 443, 449 (Tex. Crim. App.

1984)(indictment for arson must allege manner and means in which defendant started the fire) ; *Smith v. State*, 658 S.W. 2d 172, 173 (Tex. Crim. App. 1983)(indictment for gambling promotion must state manner and means by which defendant received bets and offers to bet); *Cruise v. State*, 587 S.W. 2d 403, 405 (Tex. Crim. App. 1979)(indictment for aggravated robbery must allege manner and means whereby defendant allegedly caused bodily injury); *Haecker v. State*, 571 S.W. 2d 920, 922 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978)(information for animal cruelty must allege manner and means by which defendant tortured the animal).

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the defendant prays that the Court set aside the information in the above-numbered and entitled cause.

VII.

Because of these defects:

1. The information does not accuse defendant of an "act or omission which, by law, is declared to be an offense", in violation of TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. Art. 21.01.
2. The offense is not "set forth in plain and intelligible words", in violation of TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. Art. 21.02(7).
3. The information does not state "[e]verything . . . which is necessary to be proved", in violation of TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. Art. 21.03.
4. The information does not possess "[t]he certainty . . . such as will enable the accused to plead the judgment that may be given upon it in bar of any prosecution for the same offense," in violation of TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. art. 21.04 and the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and Article I §§ 10 and 19 of the Texas Constitution.

5. The information does not "charge[]" the commission of the offense in ordinary and concise language in such a manner as to enable a person of common understanding to know what is meant and with what degree of certainty that will give the defendant notice of the particular offense with which he is charged, and enable the court, on conviction, to pronounce the proper judgment . . ." in violation of TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. art. 21.11 and the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and article I, §§ 10 and 19 of the Texas Constitution.

Respectfully submitted:

MARK STEVENS
310 S. St. Mary's Street
Tower Life Building, Suite 1920
San Antonio, TX 78205
(210) 226-1433
State Bar No. 19184200
mark@markstevenslaw.com

Attorney for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of defendant's Motion To Set Aside The Information has been delivered to the District Attorney's Office, Bexar County Justice Center, 300 Dolorosa, San Antonio, Texas, on this the 14th day of February, 2018.

MARK STEVENS

NO. 000000

STATE OF TEXAS)	IN THE COUNTY COURT
VS.)	AT LAW NUMBER FIVE
JOE SMITH)	BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

ORDER

On this the _____ day of _____, 2018, came on to be considered Defendant's Motion to Set Aside the Information, and said Motion is hereby

(GRANTED) (DENIED).

JUDGE PRESIDING