

Question

Charles Dustin Myers

Answer

Assessment of Charles Dustin Myers as a Litigant

This assessment analyzes Charles Dustin Myers' litigation history based on nine cases found matching the search criteria. This limited sample size 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](#); [02-25-00164-CV](#), [In re Charles Dustin Myers, Relator](#)), initiating legal action. However, he has also been a defendant ([SC20-142J2](#), [GEICO COUNTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY vs CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS](#); [4:24-cv-01185](#), [Myers v. Myers](#)). This suggests a willingness to both pursue and defend legal claims.

Types of Cases: Myers' cases span various areas, including traffic violations ([14-0135J2](#), [State of Texas vs. Charles Myers](#); [14-0134J2](#), [State of Texas vs. Charles Myers](#)), family law disputes ([JP01-24-OR00000002](#), [CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS vs. Margie Evonne Wilson](#); [4:24-cv-01185](#), [Myers v. Myers](#)), and mandamus proceedings ([02-25-00164-CV](#), [In re Charles Dustin Myers, Relator](#); [02-25-00166-CV](#), [In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)). The mandamus cases suggest a tendency to challenge lower court decisions or seek to compel specific actions from officials. He also appears in a small claims case ([SC20-142J2](#), [GEICO COUNTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY vs CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS](#)) as a defendant.

Motion Practice Effectiveness: Myers demonstrates a proactive approach to motion practice, filing motions for emergency relief, writs, and notices of removal (e.g., [4:24-cv-01185](#), [Myers v. Myers](#); [25-0361](#), [IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS](#)). While he appears prepared in his filings, the ultimate success of his motions is mixed. For instance, his removal attempt in [4:24-cv-01185](#), [Myers v. Myers](#) was unsuccessful due to jurisdictional issues. The mandamus cases, while demonstrating initiative, lack sufficient information to assess their outcomes.

Average Case Duration: The analyzed cases have short durations, ranging from a single day to a few weeks. However, this is likely skewed by the inclusion of traffic cases and the limited information available on the mandamus proceedings. Without complete disposition information on all cases, comparing his average case duration to industry averages is difficult.

Success Rate and Notable Outcomes: Determining a definitive success rate is challenging due to the limited sample size and lack of clear outcomes in several cases. However, the unsuccessful removal attempt in [4:24-cv-01185](#), [Myers v. Myers](#) and the denial of the writ of re-entry in [JP01-24-OR00000002](#), [CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS vs. Margie Evonne Wilson](#) indicate some setbacks. The traffic cases resulted in guilty pleas or findings.

Case Endings: The majority of the analyzed cases ended with a plea (traffic), court order (mandamus, removal), or denial of a motion (writ of re-entry). There is no indication of any cases proceeding to trial in this sample.

Most Significant Cases: The mandamus cases ([02-25-00164-CV](#), [In re Charles Dustin Myers, Relator](#); [02-25-00166-CV](#), [In re Charles Dustin Myers](#); [25-0361](#), [IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS](#)) are potentially significant as they involve challenges to legal processes or official actions. The family law case ([JP01-24-OR00000002](#), [CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS vs. Margie Evonne Wilson](#)) and the removal case ([4:24-cv-01185](#), [Myers v. Myers](#)) also offer insights into his litigation approach in different contexts.

Attorneys/Law Firms: While the data identifies some attorneys involved in Myers' cases, there isn't enough information to discern a consistent pattern or preferred firm for specific case types. Cooper Carter appears frequently, suggesting a potential working relationship.

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

Additional Insights: Myers appears involved in a range of legal matters, often taking a proactive role. He appears comfortable navigating different courts and legal procedures. However, the limited data makes it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about his overall litigation success or predict future behavior. Further investigation is recommended when facing him in litigation.

While I did not locate any matching records from Docket Alarm beyond those provided, 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. 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 was filed on January 9, 2014, and the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere for speeding over 10% above the posted limit on January 13, 2014. The court found the defendant guilty of this charge on the same day. The case status is marked as "Disposed," indicating that it has finished and been closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case is related to a traffic violation for speeding more than 10% above the posted limit. The factual background indicates that the defendant filed a plea of nolo contendere on January 13, 2014, which resulted in a guilty disposition for the speeding charge on the same date.

Motion practice: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and Charles Dustin Myers entered a nolo contendere plea to the charge of speeding over 10% above the posted limit on January 13, 2014. Subsequently, he was found guilty of the speeding offense. The motion practice in this case appears to be limited, as the primary action taken by Myers was the plea, resulting in a straightforward disposition without further motions or hearings indicated in the docket entries.

Duration: The case lasted from January 9, 2014, when it was filed, until January 13, 2014, when the plea and disposition were recorded. This results in a total duration of only four days. The quick resolution reflects a straightforward matter involving a guilty plea for speeding.

Outcome: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the charge of speeding greater than 10% above the posted limit on January 13, 2014. Subsequently, the court found the defendant guilty of the speeding charge on the same day. The case has been disposed of, indicating that the legal proceedings have concluded.

Complexity: The case involved a traffic offense for speeding over 10% above the posted limit. It was filed on January 9, 2014, and concluded with a nolo contendere plea and a guilty disposition on January 13, 2014. The straightforward nature of the case, with a clear violation and rapid resolution, indicates it was not complex. Overall, the docket reflects a typical traffic case with minimal legal intricacies.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that the case involved a speeding violation where Charles Dustin Myers entered a plea of nolo contendere and was found guilty. There is no mention of any experts being involved in the case or hired by Charles Dustin Myers.

Monetary value: The docket reflects a case filed on January 9, 2014, concerning a charge of speeding over 10% above the posted limit. The defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere and was found guilty on January 13, 2014. Given the nature of the charge, it is likely a minor traffic violation, suggesting that any monetary penalties would be relatively low, possibly ranging from a few hundred to a couple of thousand dollars in fines and court costs. No specific monetary amount is detailed in the docket entries.

[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 as indicated by the case status. It was filed on January 9, 2014, and concluded with a guilty plea for the charge of expired inspection certificate on January 17, 2014. Thus, the case has finished and been 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 subsequently, on January 17, 2014, a nolo contendere plea was entered for the charge of expired inspection certificate, which was later adjudicated as guilty. There are no entries detailing any motion practice or specific performance from Charles Dustin Myers within this docket, suggesting that his involvement may have been limited to the plea process without further motions being filed or argued.

Duration: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and concluded with a guilty disposition on January 17, 2014, resulting in a total duration of 8 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and involved a charge of expired inspection certificate. On January 17, 2014, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere and was ultimately found guilty of the offense. The case has been disposed of, indicating that all proceedings have concluded.

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

Experts: The docket does not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor does it suggest that any experts were hired by Charles Dustin Myers. The entries primarily detail the filing of the case and the plea and disposition related to an expired inspection certificate.

Monetary value: The case involved 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](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is listed as the "Relator" in the case, indicating that he is the party initiating the action, which typically makes him the Plaintiff in this context. The docket entries reflect that a petition for writ of mandamus was filed, with Myers actively participating in the proceedings through his counsel.

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

Background: The case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus filed on April 14, 2025. The factual background is not detailed in the docket entries, but the nature of the action suggests that the petitioner is seeking a court order to compel a government official or entity to perform a duty that is mandated by law. Further specifics regarding the underlying issues or the parties involved are not provided in the available entries.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case involves the filing of a petition for a writ of mandamus by Charles Dustin Myers, designated as the "Relator," on April 14, 2025. This indicates his role as the party seeking judicial intervention to compel a lower court or government official to fulfill a legal duty he alleges is required. The subsequent entry notes that the petition was submitted the same day, highlighting the promptness of his action in pursuing this legal remedy.

Duration: The case began with the filing of the petition for writ of mandamus on April 14, 2025, and included a submission on the same date. As there are no further entries or indications of any subsequent actions in the docket, the case lasted only one day from start to finish.

Outcome: The case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus that was filed and submitted on April 14, 2025. As of the latest docket entry, there are no further developments or outcomes indicated, leaving the case pending with no resolution or decision recorded.

Complexity: The case is a petition for a writ of mandamus, filed on April 14, 2025, indicating a request for a court order to compel a government official or entity to perform a duty. The simplicity of the case is underscored by the limited docket entries, consisting solely of the filing and submission of the petition, suggesting straightforward legal issues without extensive procedural complexities or multiple parties involved.

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 that it was subsequently submitted. However, there is no mention of any experts being involved in the case, nor is there any indication that experts were hired by the Relator.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that a petition for writ of mandamus was filed, but there is no information provided regarding any monetary claims or damages associated with the case. As such, it is not possible to estimate a monetary value; this case may be more focused on procedural issues rather than financial ones.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the Defendant in the case, while GEICO County Mutual Insurance Company is the Plaintiff represented by counsel Jared B Hall. The docket entries indicate that citations for Myers were unserved as of September 11, 2020, and that the Plaintiff's Original Petition was filed on September 10, 2020.

Status: The case remains open as indicated by the case status of "Citation Issued," with no evidence of a resolution or closure. The most recent entries show that a citation for the defendant, Charles Dustin Myers, has not yet been served, and the original petition was filed on September 10, 2020. Consequently, the proceedings are still ongoing.

Background: The cause of action is not explicitly detailed in the docket entries; however, the initiation of the case is marked by the filing of the Plaintiff's Original Petition on September 10, 2020. The subsequent entries indicate efforts to serve the citation to the defendant, Charles Dustin Myers, which remains unserved as of September 11, 2020. Further specifics regarding the factual background or claims made in the petition are not provided in the entries.

Motion practice: The docket entries indicate that Charles Dustin Myers, the Defendant, was unserved with a citation as of September 11, 2020, which presents significant implications for the proceedings and any defenses he might raise. The Plaintiff, GEICO County Mutual Insurance Company, represented by Jared B Hall, filed the Original Petition on September 10, 2020, and requested service through EZ Messenger on the same day as the citation status was noted. The lack of service could potentially delay the case and limit Myers' ability to respond effectively to the claims against him.

Duration: The case began on September 10, 2020, with the filing of the Plaintiff's Original Petition and continued with various service-related entries on September 11, 2020. Since there are no entries indicating a resolution or closure of the case, the duration from filing to the last recorded entry is only two days. Further information would be required to determine the total duration of the case beyond these initial entries.

Outcome: The case involves Charles Dustin Myers as the defendant, with the plaintiff having filed an Original Petition on September 10, 2020. A citation was issued on September 11, 2020, but the defendant remains unserved as of the same date. A service request was made to EZ Messenger, indicating attempts were underway to serve the defendant. The current status of the case is that the citation has been issued but not yet executed.

Complexity: The case is a small claims matter involving Charles Dustin Myers, with the plaintiff having filed an original petition on September 10, 2020. The docket shows that the citation for the defendant remains unserved as of September 11, 2020, indicating potential procedural delays. Overall, the case appears to be relatively straightforward, lacking complex legal issues or extensive procedural history thus far.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that there are no experts involved in the case, as there is no mention of expert witnesses or reports. Additionally, Charles Dustin Myers, the Defendant, was unserved with a citation as of September 11, 2020, which could significantly affect his ability to raise defenses and participate in the proceedings initiated by GEICO County Mutual Insurance Company, represented by Jared B Hall.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that the case involves a plaintiff's original petition filed on September 10, 2020, but there are no specific monetary amounts mentioned in the entries. Given the nature of civil cases, it is reasonable to estimate that the case may involve a claim in the range of several thousand

to tens of thousands of dollars, but without additional details, a precise figure cannot be determined.

[Myers v. Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the Defendant in the case, as indicated by his role in the docket entries, including the Notice of Removal filed by him. Additionally, he is listed as a Defendant among the case parties, while Morgan Michelle Myers is designated as the Plaintiff. This establishes the clear roles of each party within the context of the legal proceedings.

Status: The case has been closed as of December 6, 2024, when the court issued an order remanding the case back to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Subsequent docket entries confirm the delivery of the remand notice and indicate no further actions are pending in this court.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a Notice of Removal filed under 28 U.S.C. § 1441. The factual background suggests that the case was initially filed in the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, and was subsequently removed by Defendant Charles Dustin Myers to federal court, although the federal court ultimately determined it lacked subject matter jurisdiction, leading to the remand of the case back to state court.

Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, as a Defendant in this case, demonstrated a proactive legal strategy by filing a Notice of Removal on December 4, 2024, complete with a filing fee and extensive attachments, indicating his intent to transfer the case from state to federal court. However, this effort was short-lived, as the case was remanded back to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, on December 6, 2024, due to a determination of lack of subject matter jurisdiction, highlighting the challenges faced in jurisdictional matters.

Duration: The case was filed on December 4, 2024, and terminated just two days later on December 6, 2024. Therefore, the total duration of the case from start to finish was 2 days.

Outcome: The case was remanded to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, due to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction, as ordered by Judge Reed C. O'Connor on December 6, 2024. The Clerk of Court was directed to return the case following standard protocol, and the case is now officially closed.

Complexity: The case involves a Notice of Removal filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating a procedural complexity typically associated with jurisdictional issues. The court subsequently issued an order remanding the case back to the state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, suggesting that the initial removal was contested or improperly filed. This indicates a moderate level of complexity, primarily revolving around jurisdictional matters rather than substantive legal disputes. The case is now closed, having been returned to the original court.

Experts: The docket does not mention the involvement of any experts in the case, nor does it provide any indication that experts were hired by Charles Dustin Myers or any other party. The entries primarily focus on procedural matters related to the notice of removal and subsequent remand to state court.

Monetary value: The docket entries do not specify a monetary amount associated with the case, nor do they provide sufficient details to infer a rough estimate. The only financial detail mentioned is the payment of a filing fee of \$405.00, which suggests that the case may not involve a significant monetary claim.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is designated as the Petitioner in this case, indicating that he is the Plaintiff. The docket entries reflect his active role in filing applications and participating in hearings related to the Writ of Re-Entry, underscoring his position as the party initiating the action against Margie Evonne Wilson, the Respondent.

Status: The docket indicates that the case has been finalized, suggesting that it has concluded. However, recent entries, including a writ of re-entry denial and ongoing hearings, imply that there may still be unresolved matters or post-judgment activities taking place. Therefore, while the status is marked as finalized, the case may not be fully closed in practice due to pending issues.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be related to a Writ of Re-Entry, as evidenced by the application filed on 03/06/2024 and subsequent hearings regarding its denial due to lack of jurisdiction. The factual background indicates that the case involves a family law matter with standing orders pending from the 322nd District Court, and exhibits filed include various orders and notices pertaining to eviction and jurisdictional issues.

Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, as the Petitioner in this family law case, filed both an Application for Writ of Re-Entry and an Application for Writ of Retrieval on March 6, 2024. He participated in a special hearing on March 8, 2024, via Zoom, where the writ of re-entry was denied due to lack of jurisdiction, as explained by the judge. Multiple exhibits were filed in support of his motions, including prior court orders and notices related to the case. The ongoing proceedings in the 322nd District Court and the standing orders further complicate his request for relief regarding property possession.

Duration: The case lasted from March 6, 2024, when the application for the writs was filed, until March 8, 2024, when the writ of re-entry was denied by the judge. This indicates a duration of just two days from the filing to the conclusion of the initial proceedings.

Outcome: The court denied the plaintiff's application for a writ of re-entry due to lack of jurisdiction, as explained by the judge during a special hearing held via Zoom on March 8, 2024. The case involved family law matters with standing orders pending from the 322nd District Court. The case has been finalized following this ruling.

Complexity: The case appears to be moderately complex, involving a Writ of Re-Entry with jurisdictional issues and multiple hearings, including a special hearing via Zoom. There are several exhibits filed, including motions for summary judgment and emergency motions, indicating a contested legal matter. The case also references orders from the 322nd District Court, suggesting ongoing family law implications and procedural intricacies that necessitate careful navigation of jurisdictional challenges.

Experts: There is no indication of any experts being involved in the case, as the docket entries do not reference expert testimony or reports. The Petitioner, Charles Dustin Myers, filed applications for writs related to property possession but did not present any expert evidence during the proceedings. The writ of re-entry was denied due to a lack of jurisdiction, highlighting the procedural complexities of the ongoing family law matters in the 322nd District Court.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that this case involves a writ of re-entry and related hearings concerning jurisdiction and eviction matters, typically associated with family law disputes. However, there are no specific monetary amounts mentioned in the entries; thus, it is difficult to estimate the financial stakes involved. Given the nature of eviction proceedings and potential claims for damages or legal fees, a rough estimate could suggest the case might involve several thousand dollars, depending on the complexity and duration of the proceedings.

[IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, indicating that he is the party initiating the action, which makes him the Plaintiff. His involvement includes filing a Petition for Writ of Mandamus and a Motion to Stay, suggesting he is actively seeking judicial relief. The case also involves other parties, including Morgan Michelle Myers and the Office of the Attorney General, who are designated as Real Parties in Interest.

Status: The case is still ongoing, as indicated by the recent docket entries from May 1, 2025, which include a Notice requesting a filing fee, a Motion to Stay, and a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed on behalf of Charles Dustin Myers. These filings suggest that procedural steps are actively taking place, and the case has not yet been resolved or closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, seeking a court order to compel a specific action. The factual background is not detailed in the docket entries, but the motion to stay and the filed mandamus record suggest that there may be ongoing proceedings or actions that Myers is seeking to challenge or halt through this writ.

Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, serving as the Relator in this case, has actively engaged in motion practice by filing a Petition for Writ of Mandamus, a Motion to Stay, and a Case Record, all on the same day, May 1, 2025, indicating a strategic and proactive approach to seeking judicial relief. The opposing parties, Morgan Michelle Myers and the Office of the Attorney General, are designated as Real Parties in Interest, suggesting that the outcome of the motions will significantly impact them.

Duration: The case commenced on May 1, 2025, with the filing of a notice requesting a filing fee, along with a motion to stay, a mandamus record, and a petition for writ of mandamus, all on the same date. As there are no entries indicating the case's conclusion, it appears that the case duration cannot be determined from the provided docket information. Therefore, the case's length from start to finish remains undefined based on the current entries.

Outcome: On May 1, 2025, Charles Dustin Myers filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus, accompanied by a motion to stay and the necessary case record. The notice requesting a filing fee indicates procedural adherence, while the motion to stay suggests a strategic effort to halt proceedings pending the outcome of the mandamus petition. The filings reflect a robust legal approach to challenge a prior ruling or decision adversely affecting Myers.

Complexity: The case involves a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating a request for a court order to compel a government entity or officer to perform a duty they are legally obligated to complete. The docket entries suggest a straightforward procedural posture, with the filing of a motion to stay and the necessary case record, indicating that the complexity is likely low, primarily focusing on the legal sufficiency of the petition itself. The lack of additional parties or extensive motions further supports the conclusion that the case is not highly complex.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any expert witnesses in the case. Charles Dustin Myers, serving as the Relator, has actively filed a Motion to Stay and a Petition for Writ of Mandamus, while the opposing parties are Morgan Michelle Myers and the Office of the Attorney General. The absence of expert involvement may affect the complexity and evidentiary support of the arguments presented.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that a Petition for Writ of Mandamus has been filed by Charles Dustin Myers, along with a motion to stay. However, there is no specific monetary amount mentioned in the entries, nor does the nature of the petition imply a direct financial claim. Therefore, without further information, it is difficult to estimate the monetary value of the case. It appears to be more procedural in nature than one involving significant monetary damages.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in this case, which indicates that he is the party initiating the action and seeking relief. Therefore, he is the Plaintiff in this legal matter.

Status: The case is not yet finished and remains open, as indicated by multiple recent docket entries dated April 10, 2025, which include the filing of a motion for emergency relief, record, affidavit, submission, and a petition for writ of mandamus. These filings suggest that the proceedings are still active and that further actions are anticipated.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating that the petitioner is seeking a court order to compel a public official or entity to perform a duty that they are legally obligated to fulfill. The factual background, while not detailed in the docket entries, suggests that there may have been an urgent need for relief, as indicated by the motion for emergency relief filed on the same date.

Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, serving as the Relator, has taken significant steps in the motion practice of this case by filing a motion for emergency relief, an affidavit, and a petition for writ of mandamus on April 10, 2025. His actions indicate a pressing need for immediate judicial intervention concerning the interests of Morgan Michelle Myers, the Real party in interest. The filings reflect his role as the advocate seeking urgent relief from the court, underscoring the importance of his involvement in the legal proceedings.

Duration: The case started on April 10, 2025, with the filing of a motion for emergency relief, and all docket entries on that date indicate that the case proceedings were initiated simultaneously. Since there are no subsequent entries or dates provided, it can be inferred that the case's duration is limited to that single day, April 10, 2025. Therefore, the case lasted for one day from start to finish.

Outcome: The case involves a motion for emergency relief, along with records and an affidavit submitted on April 10, 2025. A petition for writ of mandamus was also filed on the same date, indicating a request for a higher court to compel a lower court or government official to perform a duty. The simultaneous filings suggest urgency and a critical legal strategy, but the outcome of the case is not provided in the docket entries.

Complexity: The case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus, suggesting a request for a court order to compel an action by a lower court or government official. The filings on the same day, including a motion for emergency relief, record, and affidavit, indicate a time-sensitive and potentially urgent situation. Overall, the case appears to be relatively straightforward in terms of legal complexity, focused on procedural matters rather than intricate factual disputes.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that Charles Dustin Myers, as the Relator, filed a motion for emergency relief, an affidavit, and a petition for a writ of mandamus on April 10, 2025. However, there is no mention of any experts being involved in the case, nor is there any indication that experts were hired by him.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that a motion for emergency relief and a petition for writ of mandamus were filed, but there are no specific monetary amounts mentioned. As such, it is difficult to determine the size of the case from a monetary perspective; it could be significant, potentially involving substantial damages or legal fees, but no precise estimate can be provided based on the available information.

[In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, which typically indicates that he is the party bringing the matter before the court, thus serving a role similar to that of a plaintiff. The other parties include Morgan Michelle Myers as the "Real party in interest" and Kenneth E. Newell as the "Respondent."

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 that these entries reflect ongoing procedural actions, the case has not yet finished and remains open.

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 an official or entity to perform a duty that is mandated by law. The filing on April 16, 2025, suggests that the petitioner believes there has been a failure to act in accordance with legal obligations, though specific details regarding the underlying facts and the nature of the duty sought to be enforced are not provided in the docket entries.

Motion practice: In the case, Charles Dustin Myers, serving as the Relator, filed a petition for a writ of mandamus on April 16, 2025, to compel a lower court or government official to perform a legally required duty. On the same date, he also submitted an affidavit and the relevant record, demonstrating thorough preparation and support for his motion. The case entries indicate that all documents were filed simultaneously, reflecting an organized approach to the motion practice. The case was subsequently submitted for consideration on the same day.

Duration: The case commenced on April 16, 2025, with the filing of an affidavit, record, and petition for a writ of mandamus, all occurring on the same day. Since there are no further entries or subsequent dates indicated in the docket, it appears that the case lasted only one day from start to finish.

Outcome: The case involves the filing of an affidavit, record, and a petition for a writ of mandamus on April 16, 2025, which indicates a procedural step taken by the petitioner to seek a judicial order compelling a governmental body to perform a duty. The case has been submitted for consideration, suggesting that it is awaiting a decision from the court. The outcome remains undetermined based on the provided docket entries.

Complexity: The case appears to involve a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating a potentially complex legal issue concerning the necessity of court intervention. The filing of an affidavit and record suggests that there may be factual disputes or procedural requirements at play. However, the simplicity of the entries, all filed on the same day, may indicate a straightforward procedural posture without extensive litigation history or multiple parties involved. Overall, while the petition itself suggests complexity, the docket entries do not reflect a protracted or multifaceted case.

Experts: No experts are mentioned in the case docket, and there is no indication that any experts were hired by Charles Dustin Myers, the Relator. The docket entries only reflect the filing of an affidavit, a record, and the petition for a writ of mandamus on the same date, without reference to expert involvement.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that a petition for writ of mandamus was filed, but there are no specific monetary claims or amounts mentioned. Without additional context or details about the nature of the case, it is difficult to estimate a monetary value, but cases involving writs of mandamus typically do not involve large sums; they often pertain to procedural or administrative issues rather than direct financial claims. As such, this case may be viewed as relatively modest in terms of monetary perspective, likely under \$100,000.

This memo was compiled by Vincent AI based on vLex materials available as of May 03, 2025. [View full answer on vLex](#)