



**IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
OF TEXAS**

NO. WR-78,135-04

EX PARTE CHARLES VICTOR THOMPSON, Applicant

**ON APPLICATION FOR POST-CONVICTION WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS AND MOTION TO STAY EXECUTION
FROM CAUSE NO. 782657 IN THE 262ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
HARRIS COUNTY**

Per curiam.

ORDER

We have before us a subsequent application for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to the provisions of Texas Code of Criminal Procedure Article 11.071 § 5 and a motion to stay Applicant's execution.¹

In April 1999, a jury convicted Applicant of capital murder for killing more

¹ All references to "articles" in this order refer to the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure unless otherwise specified.

than one person on April 30, 1998. *See* TEX. PENAL CODE § 19.03(a)(7). Based on the jury's answers to the special issues submitted under Article 37.071, the trial court sentenced Applicant to death. This Court affirmed Applicant's conviction, but vacated the sentence and remanded the cause for a new punishment trial.

Thompson v. State, 93 S.W.3d 16 (Tex. Crim. App. 2001). At the 2005 punishment retrial, the jury answered the punishment questions as before, and the trial court again sentenced Applicant to death. This Court affirmed the sentence on appeal.

Thompson v. State, No. AP-73,431 (Tex. Crim. App. Oct. 31, 2007) (not designated for publication).

This Court subsequently denied relief on both the initial Article 11.071 writ filed after his original trial and the initial Article 11.071 writ filed after the punishment retrial. *Thompson v. State*, Nos. WR-78,135-01 and WR-78,135-02 (Tex. Crim. App. Apr. 17, 2013) (not designated for publication). We also dismissed as an abuse of the writ a subsequent writ application that Applicant filed in the convicting court on September 24, 2015. *Thompson v. State*, No. WR-78,135-03 (Tex. Crim. App. Mar. 9, 2016) (not designated for publication).

On January 21, 2026, Applicant filed in the trial court this, his second subsequent writ application. Therein, Applicant raises five claims: (1) the trial

court violated his Sixth Amendment right to counsel by eliciting statements from an informant; (2) and (3) the trial court violated his confrontation and due process rights; (4) the medical examiner's changed testimony entitles him to relief; and (5) his counsel on the punishment retrial were ineffective in their investigation and presentation of mitigating evidence.

We have reviewed the application and find that Applicant has failed to show that he satisfies the requirements of Article 11.071 § 5 or Article 11.073.

Accordingly, we dismiss the application as an abuse of the writ without reviewing the merits of the claims raised. Art. 11.071 § 5(c). We deny Applicant's motion to stay his execution.

IT IS SO ORDERED THIS THE 27th DAY OF JANUARY, 2026.

Do Not Publish