



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

---

---

**NO. WR-45,746-04**

---

---

**EX PARTE DAVID LEONARD WOOD, Applicant**

---

---

**ON APPLICATION FOR POST-CONVICTION WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS  
AND MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION  
IN CAUSE NO. 58486-171-3 IN THE 171<sup>ST</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
EL PASO COUNTY**

---

---

***Per curiam.* KEEL and PARKER, JJ., dissented. RICHARDSON, J., not participating.**

**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.<sup>1</sup>

In November 1992, a jury convicted Applicant of the offense of capital murder.

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to "Articles" in this order refer to the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure unless otherwise specified.

*See* TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 19.03(a). The jury answered the special issues submitted under Texas Code of Criminal Procedure Article 37.071 and the trial court, accordingly, set Applicant's punishment at death.

This Court affirmed Applicant's conviction and sentence on direct appeal and ultimately denied habeas relief on his initial and first subsequent Article 11.071 writ applications. *Wood v. State*, No. AP-71,594 (Tex. Crim. App. Dec. 13, 1995) (not designated for publication); *Ex parte Wood*, No. WR-45,746-01 (Tex. Crim. App. Sept. 19, 2001) (not designated for publication); *Ex parte Wood*, 568 S.W.3d 678 (Tex. Crim. App. 2018).

The trial court ultimately scheduled Applicant's execution for March 13, 2025. On February 27, 2025, Applicant filed the instant habeas application in which he raises eight claims. Specifically, Applicant asserts that he is actually innocent (claim 1) and that the State obtained a conviction by presenting false testimony (claim 2) and suppressing evidence in violation of *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) (claim 3). He also claims that the State destroyed evidence in violation of due process (claim 4); his trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance (claim 5); his counsel represented him while operating under an actual conflict of interest (claim 6); and his rights to a unanimous jury verdict (claim 7) and the confrontation of witnesses (claim 8) were violated.

After reviewing the application, we grant Applicant's motion to stay his execution. The stay will remain in place until further order of this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED THIS THE 11<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2025.

Do Not Publish