
Imagnemonic Noiseware Pro Standalone 2.6.0.1 Serial Key Keygen

Meta By browsing this website, you agree to the use of cookies. More information The cookie settings on this website are set to "allow cookies" to give you the best browsing experience possible. If you continue to use this website without changing your cookie settings or you click "Accept" below then you are consenting to this. 191 Ga. App. 481 (1989) 382 S.E.2d 796 WILLIAMS v. THE STATE. A89A0299. Court of Appeals of Georgia. Decided May 15, 1989. Anthony R. Martin, for appellant. Stephen F. Lanier, Solicitor, for appellee. BIRDSONG, Judge. Juan Humberto Williams appeals his conviction for driving under the influence of alcohol. After a trial by jury, he was convicted of that offense and acquitted of the lesser included offense of driving under the influence of any drug or no prescription drug. Williams raises several enumerations of error. Held: 1. Appellant contends the trial court erred in allowing the State to reopen its case-in-chief by introducing his traffic citation because he had not testified at trial. In the case sub judice, the traffic citation was introduced prior to Williams' testimony as a prior similar transaction because the State anticipated being able to introduce evidence showing Williams' prior DUI offense. The introduction of the traffic citation was in compliance with Williams v. State, 250 Ga. 135 (295 SE2d 827) (1982). The trial court did not abuse its discretion in allowing the State to reopen its case-in-chief to introduce this traffic citation. See Early v. State, 256 Ga. 561 (350 SE2d 414). 2. Appellant contends the trial court erred by refusing to give a charge on his theory of the case which had been previously presented to the court by appellant's *482 counsel. Although appellant's counsel had requested a charge on his theory of the case at the conclusion of the charge on the State's case-in-chief, counsel did not raise the issue again until the completion of the charge to the jury. Since appellant failed to renew his request for a charge on his theory of the case at the completion of the court's charge on the State's case-in-chief, it was not error to refuse to give a charge on the subject. See Cato v. State, 182 Ga. App

[**Download**](#)

