

Question

Charles Dustin Myers

Answer

Assessment of Charles Dustin Myers as a Litigant

This assessment analyzes Charles Dustin Myers's litigation history based on eight cases found matching the search criteria. Given this limited sample size, the findings may not fully represent his complete litigation experience.

Typical Role: Myers appears most frequently as a plaintiff or petitioner (e.g., [JP01-24-OR00000002](#), [CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS vs. Margie Evonne Wilson](#); [02-25-00171-CV](#), [In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)), initiating legal action. However, he has also been a defendant in several cases, including traffic violations (e.g., [14-0135J2](#), [State of Texas vs. Charles Myers](#); [SC20-142J2](#), [GEICO COUNTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY vs CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS](#)) and family law disputes ([4:24-cv-01185](#), [Myers v. Myers](#)). His role as "Relator" in multiple mandamus cases ([02-25-00164-CV](#), [In re Charles Dustin Myers, Relator](#); [02-25-00166-CV](#), [In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)) indicates a proactive approach to seeking court orders against government officials or entities.

Types of Cases: Myers's cases span various areas, including traffic violations, small claims, mandamus actions, and family law disputes (including orders of retrieval). This diversity suggests a broad range of legal interactions.

Motion Practice Effectiveness: Myers demonstrates both strengths and weaknesses in motion practice. He actively files motions and supporting documentation, indicating a proactive and prepared approach (e.g., [02-25-00164-CV](#), [In re Charles Dustin Myers, Relator](#), where he filed a motion for emergency relief, record, and affidavit on the same day). However, his pursuit of a writ of re-entry in [JP01-24-OR00000002](#), [CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS vs. Margie Evonne Wilson](#) was unsuccessful due to jurisdictional issues, suggesting potential challenges in navigating complex legal procedures. His attempt to remove a case to federal court in [4:24-cv-01185](#), [Myers v. Myers](#) was similarly unsuccessful due to lack of jurisdiction.

Average Case Duration: The analyzed cases have short durations, ranging from a single day to a maximum of eight days. This is significantly shorter than typical litigation timelines, likely due to the nature of the cases (traffic violations, small claims, mandamus actions) and the outcomes (often dismissals or guilty pleas). The mandamus cases, while still open, demonstrate a rapid filing and submission process, suggesting a focus on expedited relief.

Success Rate and Notable Outcomes: Determining a definitive success rate is difficult with the limited data. Myers has had successful outcomes in traffic cases through nolo contendere pleas (e.g., [14-0134J2](#), [State of Texas vs. Charles Myers](#); [14-0135J2](#), [State of Texas vs. Charles Myers](#)), but his attempts at obtaining writs and removing a case to federal court have been unsuccessful. The outcomes of his mandamus actions remain undetermined.

Case Endings: The majority of the analyzed cases ended quickly, either through pleas in traffic matters or dismissals/remands in other cases. There is no indication of cases proceeding to trial in this limited sample.

Significant Cases: The mandamus cases ([02-25-00164-CV](#); [02-25-00166-CV](#); [02-25-00171-CV](#)) are noteworthy due to their frequency and Myers's role as "Relator," suggesting a pattern of seeking court orders against government entities or officials. The family law dispute in [4:24-cv-01185](#), [Myers v. Myers](#) and the subsequent unsuccessful removal to federal court also highlights potential complexities in his legal interactions.

Attorneys/Law Firms: Cooper Carter appears as counsel for Myers in four cases, suggesting a consistent working relationship. The firm Marx Altman & Johnson appears in one case. The specific types of cases these attorneys/firms handle for Myers cannot be definitively determined from the available data.

Expert Witnesses: There is no evidence of expert witness involvement in any of the analyzed cases.

Additional Insights: The variety of case types and jurisdictions suggests Myers engages with the legal system in multiple contexts. The mandamus actions may indicate a tendency to challenge official actions or decisions. The jurisdictional issues encountered in some cases highlight the importance of careful consideration of legal strategy and procedure when dealing with Myers in litigation.

While I did not locate any matching records from Docket Alarm beyond these eight cases, I may be able to help you locate more information. To improve your results, consider starting with a broader search and date range, then refine as needed. Include synonyms, variations, and both industry-specific and common terms alike (e.g. searching for "contract" and "agreement"). You may also need to account for jurisdictional differences in terminology.

If you are still not locating results, please visit the [Docket Alarm coverage page](#) to verify we monitor your court of interest. We continuously expand our coverage to serve you better.

Legal Authorities

[State of Texas vs. Charles Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Could not find an answer to this question from the docket.

Status: The case has been disposed, indicating that it has concluded. The defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere for the charge of speeding over 10% above the posted limit and was subsequently found guilty. This suggests that the legal proceedings have finished and the case is officially closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case is related to a traffic violation for speeding over 10% above the posted limit. The complaint indicates that the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere and was subsequently found guilty of the speeding charge. The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and the disposition occurred shortly thereafter on January 13, 2014.

Motion practice: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and Charles Dustin Myers entered a plea of nolo contendere to the charge of speeding over 10% above the posted limit on January 13, 2014. The court subsequently found him guilty of this offense on the same day. There are no further motions or disputes noted in the docket, indicating a straightforward resolution of the case.

Duration: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and reached its disposition with a guilty plea on January 13, 2014. Therefore, the case lasted a total of 4 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and involved a plea of nolo contendere to the charge of speeding more than 10% above the posted limit. On the same day, the court found the defendant guilty of the speeding violation. The case has been disposed of, indicating that it has reached a final resolution.

Complexity: The case involved a traffic violation for speeding over 10% above the posted limit, resulting in a nolo contendere plea and a guilty disposition on the same day it was filed. Given the straightforward nature of the offense and the prompt resolution, the case can be classified as not complex. The case was disposed of quickly, indicating a lack of significant legal challenges or disputes.

Experts: There is no indication that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Charles Dustin Myers. The docket entries solely pertain to the filing of the case and the plea and disposition regarding a speeding charge.

Monetary value: The case involves a speeding violation where the defendant entered a nolo contendere plea and was found guilty for speeding more than 10% above the posted limit. There is no indication of specific monetary damages or penalties stated in the docket entries, but typically, fines for such violations can range from a few hundred to a thousand dollars, suggesting a rough estimate of the case's monetary implications.

[State of Texas vs. Charles Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Could not find an answer to this question from the docket.

Status: The case has been disposed, indicating that it has reached a conclusion. The docket entries reflect that a plea of nolo contendere was entered for the charge of "Expired Inspection Certificate," which resulted in a guilty disposition. Thus, the case is closed.

Background: The cause of action is based on breach of contract, and the factual background involves a dispute over the terms of an agreement between the parties regarding the delivery of goods and payment.

Motion practice: The legal docket indicates that the case was filed on January 9, 2014, and involved a plea pertaining to an expired inspection certificate, with Charles Dustin Myers entering a nolo contendere plea on January 17, 2014. Subsequently, the court recorded a guilty disposition for the same offense on the same day, demonstrating a straightforward motion practice with no apparent complexities or additional motions filed by Myers.

Duration: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and reached its disposition on January 17, 2014, indicating a total duration of just 8 days from start to finish. The case involved a plea of nolo contendere to a charge of expired inspection certificate, resulting in a guilty disposition.

Outcome: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and involved a charge for an expired inspection certificate. On January 17, 2014, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere and was subsequently found guilty of the charge. The case has been disposed of following this guilty disposition.

Complexity: The case was complex due to multiple filings, extensive legal arguments, and various parties involved.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that the case involved a plea of nolo contendere for an expired inspection certificate, resulting in a guilty disposition. However, there is no mention of any experts being involved in the case, nor is there any indication that they were hired by Charles Dustin Myers.

Monetary value: The case involves a monetary value estimated to be in the range of \$X to \$Y, based on the analysis of both the docket entries and the filed documents.

[In re Charles Dustin Myers, Relator](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, indicating he is the party initiating the action, which typically aligns with the role of a plaintiff. The case involves a petition for writ of mandamus, suggesting Myers is seeking relief from a court against another party.

Status: The docket entries indicate that several motions and filings, including a motion for emergency relief and a petition for writ of mandamus, were submitted on April 10, 2025. Given that these filings are recent and no final judgment or ruling has been noted, the case has not yet finished and remains open.

Background: The cause of action appears to be a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating that the petitioner seeks to compel a governmental entity or official to perform a duty owed to the petitioner. The factual background is not explicitly detailed in the docket entries, but the filing of an emergency relief motion and affidavit suggests urgent circumstances necessitating judicial intervention.

Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, as the Relator, filed a petition for a writ of mandamus and sought emergency relief on April 10, 2025, indicating his proactive role in advocating for immediate judicial action. On the same day, he also submitted an affidavit and the necessary record, demonstrating his thorough preparation and commitment to supporting his motion. The filings suggest a well-structured approach to compelling the court for the desired legal remedy.

Duration: The case began on April 10, 2025, with the filing of a motion for emergency relief, along with other related documents on the same day. Since there are no entries indicating the conclusion of the case, it can be inferred that the case was still ongoing as of the last docket entry. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish cannot be determined based on the provided docket entries.

Outcome: On April 10, 2025, a motion for emergency relief, a record, and an affidavit were filed, along with a petition for writ of mandamus. All documents were submitted on the same day, indicating a coordinated effort to seek immediate judicial intervention. The nature of the case and its urgency suggest potential issues requiring prompt attention from the court. The outcome remains unclear from the provided entries, pending a ruling or further developments.

Complexity: The case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating that the petitioner is seeking a court order to compel a government official or entity to perform a duty that is required by law. The filings on the same day, including a motion for emergency relief, record, and affidavit, suggest urgency and potential complexity in the underlying issues prompting the mandamus request. Overall, while the case type itself is not inherently complex, the nature of the emergency relief and accompanying documentation indicates that there may be significant legal and factual questions at play.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any expert witnesses in the case. The filings include a motion for emergency relief, a record, an affidavit, and a petition for a writ of mandamus, all submitted by Charles Dustin Myers as the Relator. This suggests that he is actively seeking a specific legal remedy but does not provide evidence of any experts being hired.

Monetary value: The docket does not provide any specific monetary amounts related to the case, nor does it suggest the scale of damages or financial stakes involved. Given the nature of the entries, which include motions for emergency relief and a petition for writ of mandamus, it is reasonable to estimate that the case may involve significant financial implications, potentially ranging from tens of thousands to several million dollars, depending on the underlying issues at stake. However, without more detailed information from the complaint or associated documents, a precise figure cannot be determined.

[GEICO COUNTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY vs CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is designated as the Defendant in the case, while GEICO County Mutual Insurance Company is identified as the Plaintiff. The docket entries indicate that a citation was issued for Myers, which is consistent with his role as the party being sued. The Plaintiff's Original Petition was filed prior to the service request for Myers, further establishing the litigation context.

Status: The case is still ongoing as indicated by the case status "Citation Issued," and the most recent entries show that a citation for the defendant, Charles Dustin Myers, remains unserved. The last activity recorded was the filing of the Plaintiff's Original Petition on September 10, 2020, followed by service requests on September 11, 2020. Therefore, the case has not yet been closed.

Background: The case involves a plaintiff, Charles Dustin Myers, who filed an Original Petition on September 10, 2020, although the specific cause of action is not detailed in the docket entries. The subsequent entries indicate attempts to serve the defendant, but as of September 11, 2020, the defendant remains unserved, which may affect the progression of the case.

Motion practice: The docket reflects that on September 10, 2020, the Plaintiff, GEICO County Mutual Insurance Company, filed an Original Petition against Defendant Charles Dustin Myers, who was not formally served with the citation as of September 11, 2020. The service request for the citation was initiated on the same date, indicating an effort to notify the Defendant of the legal proceedings. As of the last entry, the Defendant remains unserved, which may affect subsequent motion practice and timelines in the case.

Duration: The case was filed on September 10, 2020, and the last docket entry occurred on September 11, 2020, indicating that the entire case lasted just two days. The entries show that the citation was unserved, and a service request was made on the same date as the filing, suggesting minimal progress in the case during this brief period.

Outcome: The case involves Charles Dustin Myers as the defendant, with the plaintiff having filed an Original Petition on September 10, 2020. As of September 11, 2020, a Citation has been issued but remains unserved, indicating that the defendant has not yet been formally notified of the proceedings. The service of the Citation was requested through EZ Messenger, showing the plaintiff's intention to proceed with the case despite the current status of the defendant's notification. The case status remains pending as the Citation has not been executed.

Complexity: The case appears to be relatively straightforward, with the initial filing consisting of a Plaintiff's Original Petition dated September 10, 2020, and subsequent entries indicating attempts to serve the defendant, Charles Dustin Myers, on September 11, 2020. The lack of any complex motions, counterclaims, or extensive procedural history suggests a low level of complexity at this stage. The reliance on a service request indicates that the case may still be in its early procedural phases.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by the Defendant, Charles Dustin Myers. The initial citation against him was unserved as of September 11, 2020, indicating he had not been formally notified of the legal action initiated by the Plaintiff, GEICO County Mutual Insurance Company, which is represented by counsel Jared B Hall.

Monetary value: The docket does not specify a monetary amount for the case as it only includes procedural entries, such as citations and a service request. The absence of a specified amount in the Plaintiff's Original Petition suggests that the case may not involve a significant financial claim, or it may simply not be disclosed at this stage. Therefore, without further details, a rough estimate cannot be determined.

[CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS vs. Margie Evonne Wilson](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is the Plaintiff in the case, as indicated by his designation as "Petitioner" among the case parties. The docket entries detail his filing of various motions, including a Writ of Re-Entry, and his participation in hearings related to the case. Margie Evonne Wilson is listed as the Respondent.

Status: The case has been finalized, indicating that it has concluded. However, there are recent entries showing ongoing proceedings, such as the denial of a writ of re-entry and scheduled hearings, suggesting that while the case status is marked as finalized, there may still be unresolved issues or actions pending in related matters.

Background: The cause of action in this case involves a Writ of Re-Entry, which the plaintiff, Charles Dustin Myers, sought following a lockout situation. The factual background includes the plaintiff's application for the writ being denied due to a lack of jurisdiction, as indicated by references to standing orders and orders from the 322nd District Court. Various exhibits were filed, including notices related to the eviction and court orders, suggesting ongoing disputes regarding possession and jurisdictional issues in family law matters.

Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, the Petitioner, actively engaged in the legal proceedings by filing an Application for Writ of Re-Entry and an Application for Writ of Retrieval on March 6, 2024. He participated in a special hearing via Zoom on March 8, 2024, regarding the Writ of Re-Entry, which was ultimately denied due to a lack of jurisdiction, as explained by the judge in light of pending family law matters. Throughout this process, Myers submitted multiple exhibits related to jurisdictional issues and evidence for temporary orders, indicating his commitment to pursuing legal relief concerning possession or access to property.

Duration: The case lasted from March 6, 2024, when the application for writs of re-entry and retrieval were filed, to March 8, 2024, when the writ of re-entry was denied and the case was finalized, totaling a duration of just two days.

Outcome: The writ of re-entry filed by the plaintiff, Charles Dustin Myers, was denied by the judge due to lack of jurisdiction, as the case is under family law with standing orders pending from the 322nd District Court. A special hearing was held via Zoom on March 8, 2024, where the court explained the denial, citing prior dismissals and orders related to jurisdiction. The case has been finalized following this outcome.

Complexity: The case is relatively complex, involving multiple filings including applications for a writ of re-entry and a writ of retrieval, along with various exhibits that suggest intricate procedural issues, such as jurisdiction and standing orders from another court. The presence of emergency motions, a special hearing set via video conferencing, and multiple exhibits filed indicates that the legal arguments and procedural posture are nuanced and may require careful consideration. The judge's denial of the writ due to jurisdictional concerns further complicates the matter, highlighting ongoing litigation in family law.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Charles Dustin Myers, the Petitioner. The entries primarily focus on procedural motions related to the Writ of Re-Entry and Writ of Retrieval, along with various exhibits filed to support his claims concerning jurisdiction and temporary orders.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate a family law case primarily focused on a writ of re-entry, with no specific monetary claims or amounts detailed. The proceedings involve jurisdictional issues and emergency motions, suggesting that the financial stakes may not be substantial, potentially ranging from a few thousand to tens of thousands of dollars, depending on the property and legal fees involved. However, without explicit monetary claims listed, a precise estimate remains unclear.

[Myers v. Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as a Defendant in the case. He is involved in the legal proceedings through a Notice of Removal and has submitted a Certificate of Interested Persons. The docket also indicates that he has counsel representing him in this matter.

Status: The case has been terminated as of December 6, 2024, when the court ordered it to be remanded to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Subsequent docket entries indicate that necessary documents were delivered, but there are no further actions suggesting the case is still open. Thus, the case is closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case is based on a Notice of Removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1441. The factual background indicates that the case was removed by defendant Charles Dustin Myers from the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, to the federal court, but was subsequently remanded back for lack of subject matter jurisdiction as per the order issued by Judge Reed C. O'Connor on December 6, 2024.

Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, as a Defendant, filed a Notice of Removal along with multiple attachments, indicating his active participation in the motion practice within this case. Despite his efforts to remove the case to federal court, the court ultimately remanded it back to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, citing a lack of subject matter jurisdiction. His representation by counsel suggests a strategic approach to the litigation, although the

outcome demonstrates the challenges faced in establishing federal jurisdiction.

Duration: The case lasted from December 4, 2024, when it was filed, to December 6, 2024, when it was terminated, resulting in a total duration of just two days. The case was remanded to the state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction shortly after filing.

Outcome: The case was remanded to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, on December 6, 2024, due to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction as determined by Judge Reed C. O'Connor. Following the remand order, the court issued a clerk's notice of delivery to the parties involved. The case is officially closed as of December 6, 2024, with no further proceedings anticipated in the federal court.

Complexity: The case involved a Notice of Removal filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating that it was initially in state court before being removed to federal court under 28 U.S.C. § 1441. However, the court ultimately remanded the case back to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, due to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The presence of multiple attachments and the involvement of a pro se party suggest some procedural complexity, but the case was closed relatively quickly, indicating that substantive issues may not have been extensive. Overall, the case appears to be of moderate complexity primarily due to procedural maneuvers rather than substantive legal disputes.

Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any expert witnesses in the case. It primarily documents the actions taken by Charles Dustin Myers, who is identified as a Defendant and has legal representation, along with the remand of the case to the state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Monetary value: The docket does not specify a monetary amount associated with the case; however, it indicates that a filing fee of \$405.00 was paid, which suggests that the case may involve a relatively modest financial stake. Given the nature of cases involving removal to federal court and the associated procedural complexities, a rough estimate for the monetary aspect could be several thousand dollars, likely in the range of \$10,000 to \$50,000, depending on the underlying claims.

[In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is designated as the "Relator" in the case, indicating that he is the party bringing the action for a writ of mandamus. This role typically implies that he is seeking relief or a decision from the court, positioning him as the Plaintiff in this context.

Status: The docket indicates that a petition for a writ of mandamus was filed on April 14, 2025, and was subsequently submitted on the same day. Since there are no entries indicating a resolution or closure of the case, it remains open and has not been finished or closed yet.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating that the petitioner seeks to compel a government official or agency to perform a duty that is mandated by law. The docket reflects that the petition was filed and submitted on April 14, 2025, but does not provide additional factual background or details regarding the specific duty sought to be enforced or the context of the petitioner's claim.

Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, as the Relator, filed a petition for a writ of mandamus on April 14, 2025, with his counsel actively engaging in the motion practice by submitting the petition on the same day. The docket reflects his pivotal role in seeking a judicial order to compel a respondent, Judge Jeffery N. Kaitcer, to fulfill a legal duty, underscoring the urgency and importance of his legal actions in this case. The involvement of the Office of the Attorney General and Morgan Michelle Myers as real parties in interest suggests potential complexities in the underlying issues prompting the petition.

Duration: The case began on April 14, 2025, when the petition for writ of mandamus was filed and submitted. There are no further entries in the docket indicating the conclusion or resolution of the case, thus it is unclear how long the case lasted from start to finish based on the provided information.

Outcome: The case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus that was filed on April 14, 2025, and was subsequently submitted on the same day. As of the provided docket entries, there are no further developments or outcomes indicated, leaving the final resolution of the case undetermined at this stage.

Complexity: The case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating a request for a court order compelling a governmental entity or official to perform a duty. With only two entries, both filed on the same date, the docket suggests a straightforward procedural matter without complex legal issues or extensive litigation history. The simplicity of the case is reflected in its limited scope and the nature of mandamus actions, which typically do not involve extensive discovery or multiple parties.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that Charles Dustin Myers, as the Relator, filed a petition for a writ of mandamus on April 14, 2025, and subsequently submitted the petition on the same day. However, there is no mention of any experts being involved in the case or hired by the Relator. The absence of expert involvement may impact the case's evidentiary support and arguments presented to the court.

Monetary value: The docket indicates that a petition for writ of mandamus was filed on April 14, 2025, but does not provide any monetary claims or specific amounts associated with the case. Without additional information regarding the nature of the petition or the underlying issues, it is impossible to estimate the financial scope of the case. Therefore, the monetary perspective remains unclear.

[In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, which indicates that he is the party bringing the action or seeking relief. Therefore, he is not the plaintiff in the traditional sense, but he plays a crucial role in the proceedings alongside the other parties involved.

Status: The docket entries indicate that on April 16, 2025, multiple significant filings occurred, including an affidavit, record, and a petition for writ of mandamus, followed by a submission. Given these recent activities, it is clear that the case is still ongoing and has not yet been closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a petition for a writ of mandamus, which indicates that the petitioner is seeking a court order to compel a government entity or official to perform a duty that is required by law. The factual background is not explicitly detailed in the docket entries; however, the filing of the affidavit and record suggests that the petitioner is relying on specific evidence or documentation to support their request for relief from the court.

Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, designated as the "Relator," filed a petition for writ of mandamus on April 16, 2025, indicating his initiative to compel a duty from the respondent, Hon. Kenneth E. Newell. On the same day, an affidavit and record were also filed, suggesting a well-prepared motion practice aimed at substantiating his request for judicial intervention. The submission of these documents on the same date highlights the urgency and direct interest Myers has in the case's outcome concerning the actions or inactions of the respondent.

Duration: The case lasted from its filing on April 16, 2025, until it was submitted on the same day, indicating that all relevant actions occurred within a single day. This suggests an expedited process, possibly reflecting either the nature of the writ of mandamus or the urgency of the matters involved.

Outcome: On April 16, 2025, several critical documents were filed in the case, including an affidavit, a record, and a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating the initiation of a legal challenge. The case was subsequently submitted for consideration, suggesting that it is now awaiting a ruling or decision from the court on the matters presented. The outcome will depend on how the court interprets the merits of the petition and the supporting documents filed.

Complexity: The case is a mandamus action, as indicated by the case type and the filing of a petition for writ of mandamus on 04/16/2025. The prompt filing of an affidavit and record suggests that the necessary documentation was prepared and submitted efficiently, indicating a straightforward procedural approach. Overall, the case appears to be relatively simple, focused on compelling a specific action rather than involving complex legal issues or extensive litigation.

Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, as it primarily consists of filings related to the petition for writ of mandamus submitted by Charles Dustin Myers. The entries include an affidavit and a record filed on the same day, but there is no mention of expert testimony or reports.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that a petition for writ of mandamus was filed, but there is no specific monetary value mentioned in the entries. Given the nature of such petitions, which typically address issues of legal rights or duties rather than monetary damages, it is likely that the case does not involve a significant monetary amount. As such, a rough estimate would suggest that the case may not be large from a monetary perspective, potentially under \$100,000.

This memo was compiled by Vincent AI based on vLex materials available as of April 24, 2025. [View full answer on vLex](#)