No. _____ (CAPITAL CASE)

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

REINALDO DENNES,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF TEXAS,

Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari
to the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals

APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MAUREEN FRANCO
Federal Public Defender
Western District of Texas

Kathryn Wood Hutchinson
Supervisor, Capital Habeas Unit

Donna Coltharp*
Assistant Federal Public Defender
919 Congress Avenue, Suite 950
Austin, Texas 78701
737-207-3017 (tel.)
Donna_Coltharp@fd.org
* Counsel of Record

Reinaldo Dennes is scheduled for execution November 19, 2026.

	APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI	Appendix Page
A	*Ex Parte Dennes,* No. WR-34,627-03 (November 18, 2026)	APP 1a

APPENDIX A

IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TEXAS

NO. WR-34,627-03

EX PARTE REINALDO DENNES, Applicant

ON APPLICATION FOR POST-CONVICTION WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND MOTION TO STAY EXECUTION FROM CAUSE NO. 0750313-B IN THE 263RD DISTRICT COURT HARRIS COUNTY

Per curiam.

O R D E R

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]

Applicant was convicted of capital murder and sentenced to death in

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

September 1997 for the 1996 murder of Janos Szucs committed in the course of committing or attempting to commit robbery. We affirmed the conviction and sentence on direct appeal. *Dennes v. State*, No. AP-72,966 (Tex. Crim. App. Jan. 5, 2000) (not designated for publication). We also denied relief on Applicant's initial Article 11.071 application for a writ of habeas corpus. *Ex parte Dennes*, No. WR-34,627-02 (Tex. Crim. App. Dec. 18, 2013) (not designated for publication).

On November 11, 2026, Applicant filed in the trial court this, his first subsequent writ application. Therein, he raises five claims. First, he claims that new scientific evidence discredits the eyewitness testimony identifying him as the shooter of surviving victim David Copeland. Second, he complains that the State violated due process by suppressing favorable evidence of David Balderas's relationship with the Houston Police Department. Third and fourth, he complains that the State violated due process by knowingly or unknowingly presenting false testimony through Balderas. And, finally, he complains that he was denied the effective assistance of trial counsel because trial counsel failed to adequately investigate and present mitigating evidence.

We have reviewed the application and find that Applicant has failed to show that his allegations satisfy the requirements of Article 11.071 § 5. Accordingly, we

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

IT IS SO ORDERED THIS THE 18th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026.

Do not publish