

Question

Roderick Marx

Answer

Attorney Performance Assessment: Roderick Marx

This assessment of Roderick Marx is based on the detailed analysis of 50 cases matching the specified search criteria, supplemented by aggregate data. It's important to note that while the aggregate data encompasses a larger dataset (2627 cases), the in-depth analysis is limited to this smaller subset and may not fully represent the breadth of Mr. Marx's practice.

Typical Role & Case Types:

Roderick Marx consistently represents petitioners in family law cases, specifically divorce proceedings. The analyzed cases exclusively involve divorce, both with and without children. The aggregate data supports this specialization, with no indication of work outside of family law.

Motion Practice Effectiveness:

Mr. Marx demonstrates proficiency in initiating cases and managing the early procedural stages. He consistently files original petitions, motions for withdrawal of counsel (when applicable), and effectively utilizes waivers of service to expedite proceedings (e.g., [DF-15-03298 *Habip Kargin v. Patricia Godina*; 92571-86](#) [In the Matter of the Marriage of Regina Clarke and Samuel Clarke, III](#)). However, a recurring negative indicator is the high number of dismissals for want of prosecution (e.g., [DF-14-18800 *Antonio Rocha, Jr. v. Sarah Rocha*; DF-15-00416 *Dale Switzer v. Brian Switzer*](#)). This suggests a potential weakness in maintaining momentum and actively pursuing cases beyond the initial filings, a point opposing counsel could leverage.

Average Case Duration & Outcomes:

The average duration of the analyzed cases is approximately six months, ranging from two months (e.g., [15-02199-431 *In the Matter of the Marriage of Thomas L. Bailey and Wendy L. Bailey*](#)) to over two years ([DF-14-22294 *Suzanne Lee v. Jason Lee*](#)). While the shorter durations for uncontested divorces align with industry averages, the longer durations coupled with dismissals for want of prosecution suggest inefficiency in certain cases. Based on the analyzed cases, a significant portion of Mr. Marx's cases end in dismissal for want of prosecution, indicating a lower success rate than typical family law practitioners. However, when cases proceed to judgment, he appears to achieve favorable outcomes for his clients, often through agreed orders or prove-up hearings (e.g., [DF-15-03296 *Andres Aguilar v. Anel Verber*; DF-15-05381 *Vianey Garcia v. Armando Garcia*](#)). It is crucial to consider the limitations of the sample size when interpreting this data. The aggregate data suggests a much larger caseload, and the dismissals may represent a smaller percentage of his overall outcomes.

Case Resolution:

The majority of analyzed cases end in one of two ways: dismissal for want of prosecution or an agreed final decree/judgment following a prove-up hearing. This suggests a tendency towards negotiated settlements rather than contested trials. This preference for settlement could be a valuable point for opposing counsel to consider during negotiations.

Significant Cases & Clients:

No single case stands out as particularly significant or noteworthy in terms of legal precedent or high monetary value. The analyzed cases primarily involve routine divorce proceedings with relatively modest financial implications. The aggregate data reveals frequent interaction with the State of Texas and the Attorney General's office, likely related to child support enforcement, but does not point to any major private clients.

Expert Witness Usage:

There is no evidence of Roderick Marx utilizing expert witnesses in the analyzed cases. This aligns with the relatively straightforward nature of the divorce proceedings observed.

Additional Insights:

The high volume of cases handled by Mr. Marx, as indicated by the aggregate data, suggests a high-volume practice model. This may contribute to the observed pattern of dismissals for want of prosecution, as resource allocation across a large caseload can be challenging. Opposing counsel should be aware of this potential vulnerability and prepared to capitalize on any delays or lack of responsiveness. The aggregate data also reveals that Mr. Marx appears before certain judges (David Lopez, Dennise Garcia, James Martin) far more frequently than others. Understanding these judicial preferences and tendencies could be advantageous in litigation.

Strategic Approach for Opposing Counsel:

When facing Mr. Marx, opposing counsel should be prepared for an initial flurry of activity followed by potential periods of inactivity. Diligence in monitoring deadlines and proactively moving the case forward is crucial. Leveraging the potential for delays or lack of responsiveness could be a strategic advantage. A willingness to negotiate and settle, given Mr. Marx's apparent preference for avoiding trial, could also be a fruitful approach. Finally, familiarity with the judges he frequently appears before could provide valuable insights into potential judicial biases or procedural preferences.

Legal Authorities

[In the Matter of the Marriage of REGINA CLARKE and SAMUEL CLARKE, III](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick D. Marx represented the Plaintiff, Regina J. Clarke, in the case. The docket indicates that he is listed as counsel for the Plaintiff, while Samuel E. Clarke, III is identified as the Defendant. The entries reflect the procedural steps in a divorce case, with the original petition filed by the Plaintiff and the Defendant's waiver of service noted.

Status: The case has been disposed, indicating that it has finished and been closed. The final entry in the docket is the Decree of Divorce dated April 30, 2015, which signifies the conclusion of the proceedings. All relevant filings and orders leading to this disposition have been documented, confirming that there are no outstanding issues.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on February 24, 2015. The factual background suggests that the parties were involved in a marital relationship that has now led to the initiation of legal proceedings for dissolution of marriage, culminating in the "Decree of Divorce" issued on April 30, 2015. The "Answer Waiver of Service" filed on April 15, 2015, implies that the respondent acknowledged the proceedings without the need for formal service of process.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily involved the filing of the Original Petition for Divorce on February 24, 2015, followed by the Answer Waiver of Service on April 15, 2015, which indicates that Roderick Marx chose to waive formal service of process. The Decree of Divorce was issued shortly thereafter on April 30, 2015, signaling the conclusion of the case, with the Notice of Court Order also mailed on the same day. Roderick Marx's motion performance appears to have been straightforward, as he did not contest the proceedings, facilitating a prompt resolution.

Duration: The case lasted from its filing date on February 24, 2015, until it was disposed of with a Decree of Divorce on April 30, 2015. This results in a total duration of approximately two months and six days. The case included key entries such as the Original Petition for Divorce and the Answer Waiver of Service, indicating a relatively straightforward process.

Outcome: The case was finalized with a Decree of Divorce issued on April 30, 2015, indicating that the marriage was legally dissolved. Prior to this, the defendant acknowledged receipt of the petition by filing an Answer Waiver of Service on April 15, 2015. The original petition for divorce was filed on February 24, 2015, and the case was recorded on the docket sheet on February 25, 2015. The case status is marked as disposed, confirming the conclusion of all proceedings related to the divorce.

Complexity: The case involves a divorce without children, indicating a potentially straightforward dissolution of marriage. Key docket entries include the original petition for divorce, an answer with waiver of service, and a decree of divorce, all of which suggest that the parties likely reached an amicable resolution without significant disputes. The timeline shows a relatively quick process, completed within a few months, reflecting a low complexity in the legal proceedings.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily pertain to procedural documents related to the divorce proceedings.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce, as indicated by the "Decree Of Divorce" and "Original Petition FOR DIVORCE" entries. Typically, divorce cases may involve division of assets, alimony, and child support, but no specific monetary amounts are mentioned in the docket. Given the nature of divorce proceedings, a rough estimate of the case's monetary implications could range from tens of thousands to potentially several hundred thousand dollars, depending on the assets involved.

[In the Matter of the Marriage of Thomas L. Bailey and Wendy L. Bailey](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx served as counsel for the Petitioner, Thomas L. Bailey, in the divorce case against Respondent Wendy L. Bailey. This indicates that Marx represented the interests of the plaintiff in the proceedings.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the "Final Order/Judgment/Decree" dated May 19, 2015, which finalized the divorce between Thomas L. Bailey and Wendy L. Bailey. The case status is marked as "Inactive: Disposed," confirming that all matters have been resolved and the file has been sent to Records Management for storage.

Background: The cause of action in this case is divorce, initiated by the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on March 19, 2015. The case involves parties Thomas L. Bailey and Wendy L. Bailey, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on May 19, 2015, which effectively closed the case. A waiver of service was filed by Wendy L. Bailey on May 14, 2015, indicating her acknowledgment of the proceedings.

Motion practice: The case involves a divorce proceeding between Thomas L. Bailey and Wendy L. Bailey, initiated with the Original Petition for Divorce filed on March 19, 2015. A Waiver of Service was executed by Wendy L. Bailey on May 14, 2015, indicating her acceptance of the proceedings without contest. The court issued a Final Decree of Divorce on May 19, 2015, effectively closing the case, and the Notice of Judgment was sent to Wendy L. Bailey on May 20, 2015. Notably, there is no indication of any motion practice or performance by Roderick Marx within the docket entries provided.

Duration: The case lasted from the filing of the Original Petition for Divorce on March 19, 2015, until the Final Order/Judgment was issued on May 19, 2015. This results in a total duration of exactly two months.

Outcome: The case involved a divorce proceeding between Thomas L. Bailey and Wendy L. Bailey, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on May 19, 2015, which closed the case. Following the judgment, necessary notifications were sent to the parties involved, and the case was deemed inactive and disposed

of by July 30, 2015, with records subsequently filed for management and storage.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, indicated by the lack of complex custody or financial issues. The docket entries reflect a clear progression from the original petition to the final decree, suggesting that both parties likely reached an agreement without significant disputes. The timeline spans only a few months, and the procedural steps taken are typical for an uncontested divorce, indicating low complexity.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they mention any experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily pertain to procedural aspects of a divorce case involving parties named Bailey.

Monetary value: The docket indicates that this case involved a divorce proceeding between Thomas L. Bailey and Wendy L. Bailey, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce on May 19, 2015. While no specific monetary amount is mentioned, divorce cases typically involve the division of assets, alimony, and possibly child support, suggesting that the financial stakes could range from thousands to potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars depending on the parties' financial circumstances. Without additional details about the assets or liabilities involved, a rough estimate of the case's monetary value could reasonably fall within the range of \$50,000 to \$200,000.

[In the Matter of the Marriage of ROBERT SAULTER and RHONDA SAULTER](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick D. Marx served as counsel for the Plaintiff, Robert E. Sautler, in the case. The docket indicates that the Defendant was Rhonda L. Sautler, and the entries reflect various procedural aspects of the divorce case involving the Sautler parties.

Status: The case has been dismissed, as indicated by the case status and the entry dated 09/11/2018, which reflects an order to dismiss. Therefore, the case has finished and been closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on February 5, 2015. The docket reveals a series of procedural entries, including service of citation and responses from the parties involved, with the last significant entry being an order to dismiss on September 11, 2018.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case includes the dismissal order dated September 11, 2018, which likely indicates a resolution or conclusion of pending matters. Prior to this, a dismissal for want of prosecution (DWOP) was scheduled for September 7, 2018, suggesting potential inaction by the parties involved. However, there is no direct reference to Roderick Marx in the docket entries, indicating that his motion performance may not have been documented or was not a significant factor in this case. The essential filings and activities revolve around parenting certificates, an answer, and the original petition for divorce, with the timeline reflecting procedural developments rather than specific motions by Roderick Marx.

Duration: The case began on February 5, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, and it concluded with an order to dismiss on September 11, 2018. Therefore, the case lasted approximately 3 years and 7 months from start to finish.

Outcome: The case was filed with an Original Petition for Divorce on February 5, 2015, and involved parties Rhonda and Robert Sautler, who both submitted Parenting Certificates on July 14, 2015. Following various procedural entries, including notices and service returns, a dismissal order was issued on September 11, 2018, indicating that the case has been officially dismissed. The status of the case is thus marked as "Dismissed."

Complexity: The case appears to involve a divorce with children, indicated by the case type "Divorce - Children," and has a history of multiple entries over several years, including parenting certificates and a name change. The docket entries suggest a progression from the original petition for divorce to an order to dismiss, indicating potential resolution or withdrawal of the case. The relatively straightforward nature of the entries, with standard procedural steps and no indication of significant disputes or complexities, suggests that the case was likely not very complex.

Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural matters related to the divorce proceedings.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that this case involves a divorce proceeding, as evidenced by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on 02/05/2015. However, there are no specific monetary claims or damages mentioned in the entries; thus, it is difficult to ascertain a precise monetary value. Given the nature of divorce cases, rough estimates for such cases can typically range from a few thousand dollars to several hundred thousand, depending on the assets and issues involved.

[DALE SWITZER vs. BRIAN SWITZER](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx represented the petitioner, Dale J. Switzer, in the case. The docket indicates that Marx was involved as counsel for the petitioner, while Brian G. Switzer was the respondent. The case pertains to a divorce, and the entries reflect various procedural steps taken in the litigation process.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status labeled "CLOSED." The last docket entry, dated July 2, 2015, notes a dismissal for want of prosecution, suggesting that the case was not actively pursued and ultimately concluded. All relevant entries preceding this dismissal reflect attempts at service

and procedural filings related to a divorce petition.

Background: The cause of action in this case is an Original Petition for Divorce filed by Dale J. Switzer against Roderick Dale Marx. The factual background indicates that various attempts were made to serve the respondent, including citations by posting and due diligence efforts, suggesting challenges in establishing contact with the respondent. Ultimately, the case was dismissed for want of prosecution, reflecting the lack of progress in moving the divorce proceedings forward.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case culminated in a dismissal for want of prosecution on July 2, 2015, indicating a lack of action by the petitioner, Dale J. Switzer, after initial filings. Roderick Dale Marx, acting as the attorney for the petitioner, did not appear to have made any financial contributions or significant motion filings throughout the case, which may reflect a lack of engagement or issues with case management. The series of due diligence attempts and citations by posting suggest attempts to serve the respondent, Brian G. Switzer, but ultimately led to the case being closed without further legal proceedings.

Duration: The case was filed on January 9, 2015, and closed with a dismissal for want of prosecution on July 2, 2015. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately 6 months and 24 days.

Outcome: The case, which involved a divorce petition filed by Dale J. Switzer against Roderick Dale Marx, was ultimately dismissed for want of prosecution on July 2, 2015. Prior to the dismissal, various attempts were made to serve the respondent, including citations by posting and due diligence efforts documented between January 9 and January 22, 2015. The case status is now closed, indicating that no further proceedings will take place. Financial assessments for both parties show that Dale J. Switzer incurred a total fee of \$377.00, while Roderick Dale Marx had no financial assessments recorded.

Complexity: The case involves a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal matter. The docket entries show multiple attempts to serve the respondent and ultimately a dismissal for want of prosecution, suggesting complications in proceeding with the case rather than substantive legal complexity. Overall, the case appears to lack significant legal intricacies, focusing instead on procedural issues related to service and prosecution.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural aspects and filings related to the divorce case, without reference to expert testimony or assessments.

Monetary value: The case titled "DALE SWITZER vs. BRIAN SWITZER" appears to involve a divorce, as indicated by the original petition. The financial information shows that one party, Dale J. Switzer, had a total financial assessment of \$377.00, while the other party, Roderick Dale Marx, had no financial assessment. Given the nature of divorce cases and the financial assessment presented, it can be roughly estimated that the monetary value of the case is relatively small, likely under \$1,000.

[In the Matter of the Marriage of Scott F. Glisson and Christine Glisson](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented Scott F. Glisson, the Petitioner in the case, which involved a divorce proceeding. The docket entries indicate that the final decree of divorce was granted to Scott F. Glisson, confirming his role as the party initiating the legal action.

Status: The case is marked as "Inactive: Disposed," indicating it has been closed. The final decree of divorce was issued on September 30, 2015, and subsequent entries confirm that the necessary notifications were made and the file was sent to records management for storage. Therefore, this case has indeed finished and been closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case was a divorce, initiated by the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on July 29, 2015, by one of the parties, Scott F. Glisson. The factual background indicates that a final decree of divorce was issued on September 30, 2015, after the husband appeared in court with an attorney, testifying to a global waiver and confirmed signatures, leading to the granting of the divorce.

Motion practice: The docket entries indicate that Roderick Marx was not directly involved in the motions or filings within this case, which primarily pertains to the divorce proceedings between Christine Glisson and Scott F. Glisson. The case progressed with the filing of a petition for divorce on July 29, 2015, followed by significant entries on September 23, 2015, and September 30, 2015, culminating in a final decree of divorce, suggesting a straightforward uncontested process. There are no recorded motions or performances attributed to Roderick Marx within the provided docket entries.

Duration: The case lasted from July 29, 2015, when the Original Petition for Divorce was filed, until September 30, 2015, when the Final Decree of Divorce was issued, totaling approximately two months and one day. The significant events leading to the final judgment included a waiver of service and a judicial entry confirming the husband's appearance and testimony, culminating in the divorce being granted.

Outcome: The case resulted in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on September 30, 2015, concluding the proceedings between parties Christine Glisson and Scott F. Glisson. The husband appeared with legal representation, and a global waiver was executed, confirming both parties' consent to the divorce. The case status is marked as inactive and disposed, with all relevant documentation, including a notice sent to the Bureau of Vital Statistics, filed appropriately. The docket entries indicate that all procedural requirements were met, leading to the closure of the case.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal matter. The final decree was issued on September 30, 2015, following a judicial entry that confirmed the husband's appearance with an attorney and a global waiver, suggesting that both parties were in agreement on the terms. The docket entries reflect a standard procedural progression with no indications of disputes or complexities, leading to a quick resolution and subsequent closure of the case. Overall, the case can be characterized as not complex.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that the case involved a divorce between Christine Glisson and Scott F. Glisson, with no mention of experts being involved or hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily detail procedural actions and the final decree, with no indication of expert testimony or involvement.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce proceeding between Christine Glisson and Scott F. Glisson, culminating in a final decree on September 30, 2015. No specific monetary amounts are indicated in the docket entries, but divorce cases can often involve asset division, alimony, or child support considerations; thus, a rough estimate of the case's monetary value could range from a few thousand to several hundred thousand dollars depending on the parties' assets and financial circumstances.

[VIANEY GARCIA vs. ARMANDO GARCIA](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx served as counsel for the petitioner, Vianey G. Garcia, in the case. This indicates that he represented the interests of the plaintiff party in the legal proceedings. The respondent in the case was Armando Garcia.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status metadata. The last docket entries date back to June 23, 2015, suggesting that all proceedings and necessary filings have been completed. The presence of a "NOTICE OF JUDGMENT MAILED" entry further implies that the final judgment was issued, concluding the case.

Background: The cause of action appears to be related to a family law matter, as indicated by the "NEW CASE FILED (OCA) - FAMILY" entry. The original petition was filed on March 24, 2015, suggesting that the case involves issues pertinent to family dynamics, potentially including custody, divorce, or support matters. Financial information is also referenced, which could indicate that financial aspects are a key component of the dispute.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around the activities of the petitioner, Vianey G. Garcia, represented by Roderick Dale Marx. Significant entries include the filing of the original petition on March 24, 2015, and subsequent procedural steps such as the waiver and prove up on June 22 and June 23, 2015, respectively. The docket reflects a clear progression towards resolution, culminating in the notice of judgment mailed on the same day as the prove up, indicating a streamlined and effective motion performance by Marx in advocating for his client.

Duration: The case lasted from the filing of the original petition on March 24, 2015, until the notice of judgment mailed on June 23, 2015, totaling approximately three months. The case was closed shortly after this judgment, indicating a relatively swift resolution. The docket shows several key entries within this timeframe, reflecting active proceedings leading to the final judgment.

Outcome: The case, initiated on March 24, 2015, with the filing of an Original Petition and subsequent case filing cover sheet, concluded with a judgment on June 23, 2015, as indicated by the notice of judgment mailed on the same day. A waiver was recorded on June 22, 2015, suggesting that one party may have relinquished their right to contest certain issues, which facilitated the resolution process. The case is officially marked as closed, indicating that all matters have been resolved and no further actions are pending.

Complexity: The case appears to be relatively straightforward, as indicated by the limited number of docket entries and the fact that it was a family law matter, which often involves simpler, more direct proceedings. Key entries such as the "Original Petition," "Waiver," and "Prove Up" suggest that the parties may have reached an agreement without extensive litigation. The case status is marked as "CLOSED," implying that it was resolved efficiently without protracted legal battles.

Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor does it mention that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily consist of procedural documents and notices related to the case, with no reference to expert testimony or consultation.

Monetary value: The docket entries do not provide a specific monetary amount related to the case. However, the mention of "Financial Information" suggests that there may have been financial claims involved, likely pertaining to family law matters, which could range from child support to property division. Without explicit figures, it is reasonable to estimate the monetary stakes could be in the thousands, depending on the complexity of the financial issues.

[CONSTANCE WILLIAMS vs. NATHAN WILLIAMS](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx represented Constance R. Williams, the petitioner, in the case, which involved an original petition for divorce. The docket entries indicate that he was actively involved as counsel for the plaintiff throughout the proceedings.

Status: The case has been concluded and is marked as "CLOSED." The docket entries indicate a series of procedural steps related to a divorce case initiated on December 26, 2014, with the last recorded activity occurring on March 3, 2015. Financial assessments and payments were completed, further indicating that all necessary actions have been finalized.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed by Constance R. Williams on December 26, 2014. The case is categorized under family law, and the docket reflects the financial assessment associated with the filing.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily involves Constance R. Williams, represented by attorney Roderick Dale Marx, who filed an original petition for divorce on December 26, 2014. Subsequent docket entries indicate procedural actions such as a waiver of service and a report to Austin, suggesting ongoing litigation efforts. The entries do not provide specific details regarding the performance of Roderick Marx in motions, but his representation of the petitioner indicates an active role in advocating for her interests throughout the divorce proceedings.

Duration: The case began with the filing of the original petition for divorce on December 26, 2014, and it concluded with the case status marked as closed. The last relevant docket entry occurred on March 3, 2015, indicating that the case lasted for approximately two months and a week from start to finish.

Outcome: The case, initiated by Constance R. Williams with an original petition for divorce filed on December 26, 2014, proceeded with a waiver of service on March 2, 2015, followed by a prove-up hearing reported on March 3, 2015. The financial assessment indicated a total amount of \$285.00, which was fully paid by the petitioner, and the case status is now marked as closed.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a straightforward legal matter. The docket entries show that the case was initiated with an original petition for divorce and progressed through a waiver of service and a prove-up hearing, suggesting minimal contention between the parties. The financial aspect appears to be settled, with all payments recorded, and the case status is closed, further indicating a lack of complexity.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they suggest that experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily pertain to procedural matters related to a divorce case filed by Constance R. Williams.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on 12/26/2014, but no specific monetary amount is mentioned in the docket entries. The only financial information provided relates to a total financial assessment of \$285.00, which likely pertains to court fees rather than the value of the divorce settlement or any other claims. Therefore, it is reasonable to estimate that the case's monetary implications could be minimal, primarily revolving around court costs rather than substantial financial stakes.

[KADDY TOURAY vs. MARCUS BOWEN](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx represented the petitioner, Kaddy Touray, in the case, which involved an original petition for divorce. The docket entries indicate various procedural steps taken by the petitioner, including the filing of an amended petition and attempts at serving the respondent, Marcus D. Bowen. The case ultimately ended with a dismissal for want of prosecution.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status marked "CLOSED." The last significant entry shows a dismissal for want of prosecution dated 09/03/2015, suggesting that the matter has been resolved and no further action is pending.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "ORIGINAL PETITION FOR DIVORCE" filed on March 26, 2015. The docket entries reflect various procedural steps taken, including attempts to serve the defendant through posting and multiple citations issued, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 3, 2015. The case appears to have faced issues with service, as evidenced by the due diligence attempts noted on May 18 and May 26, 2015.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case involved a series of procedural steps leading to a dismissal for want of prosecution, with significant entries including multiple due diligence attempts to serve the respondent, Marcus D. Bowen, and the filing of an amended petition and original petition for divorce by Kaddy Touray, represented by Roderick Dale Marx. Roderick Marx's performance was marked by his active involvement in submitting formal documents such as the amended petition and representation during the prove-up hearing, although ultimately, the case was dismissed, indicating challenges in advancing the matter effectively.

Duration: The case lasted from March 26, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, until September 3, 2015, when it was dismissed for want of prosecution, totaling approximately 5 months and 8 days.

Outcome: The case was dismissed for want of prosecution on September 3, 2015, following several procedural steps, including a hearing for prove up on August 4, 2015, and multiple attempts to serve the defendant, Kaddy Touray, via posting and citation between May 1 and May 26, 2015. The docket indicates that all financial assessments and payments were completed, totaling \$378, and the case is marked as closed with Judge James Martin presiding.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a straightforward legal matter typically involving fewer complexities than custody disputes. The docket reflects multiple attempts at service and a dismissal for want of prosecution, suggesting procedural challenges rather than substantive legal issues. Overall, the case appears to be of low complexity, primarily revolving around procedural compliance rather than contested legal arguments.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any evidence suggesting that Roderick Marx hired experts. The entries primarily focus on procedural matters such as petitions, citations, and due diligence attempts without reference to expert testimony or reports.

Monetary value: The docket indicates that this was a family law case, specifically a divorce proceeding, which typically involves issues such as asset division, alimony, and child support. However, there is no specific monetary amount mentioned in the entries, nor any indication of the financial stakes involved in the divorce. The financial assessment reflects a total of \$378.00 in payments and credits related to court fees, suggesting that while the case may have had significant personal implications, the monetary aspect linked to court costs appears relatively modest. Therefore, without further details on assets or claims, a rough estimate of the case's monetary value cannot be determined, but it is likely centered on family law issues that could range widely in value.

[ANTONIO ROCHA, JR. vs. SARAH ROCHA](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx represented the petitioner, Antonio Rocha, Jr., in the case, which involved a divorce proceeding. The docket entries indicate that the case was filed on October 2, 2014, and included various procedural steps leading up to a dismissal for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status marked as "CLOSED." The last significant entry in the docket is a dismissal for want of prosecution dated 11/10/2015. Prior entries detail the original petition for divorce and subsequent actions, including a notice of judgment and a waiver of service. Overall, the case appears to have reached its conclusion without further proceedings.

Background: The cause of action in this case was a divorce, as indicated by the filing of the "Original Petition for Divorce" on October 2, 2014. The docket reflects procedural steps taken in the case, including a waiver of service and a report to Austin, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case predominantly revolved around the original petition for divorce filed by Antonio Rocha, Jr., represented by Roderick Dale Marx, on October 2, 2014. The case progressed with various procedural entries, including a waiver of service and a prove-up, but ultimately culminated in a dismissal for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015, indicating a failure to advance the case. Roderick Marx's performance as counsel can be inferred as insufficient to maintain the momentum needed to keep the case active, leading to the eventual dismissal.

Duration: The case began on October 2, 2014, when the original petition for divorce was filed, and it concluded with a dismissal for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015. Therefore, the case lasted for a total of 1 year, 1 month, and 8 days.

Outcome: The case, initiated by Antonio Rocha, Jr. with an original petition for divorce filed on October 2, 2014, ultimately resulted in a dismissal for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015. Prior to the dismissal, the court processed various entries including a waiver of service and a report to Austin, with a financial assessment indicating full payment of fees amounting to \$336. The case is now closed, reflecting a lack of further action or prosecution from the petitioner.

Complexity: The case, categorized as a "DIVORCE WITH CHILDREN," was initiated on October 2, 2014, with an original petition for divorce. The docket reflects minimal complexity, with a waiver of service and a subsequent prove-up, indicating that the parties likely reached an agreement. The case was ultimately dismissed for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015, suggesting a lack of ongoing disputes or issues requiring resolution. Overall, the proceedings appear straightforward and resolved without extensive litigation.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily detail procedural actions, including dismissals and filings related to a divorce case.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce proceeding initiated by Antonio Rocha, Jr., with a total financial assessment of \$336.00, which likely pertains to court fees rather than the monetary value of the divorce settlement itself. Since no specific monetary value related to assets or alimony is mentioned in the docket, it can be estimated that the financial implications of this case are relatively modest, focused primarily on legal costs rather than a significant monetary dispute.

PARMINDER VIRK vs. LAURA QUIJANO

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Parminder S. Virk, in the case. The docket entries indicate that he was involved in the proceedings, including filing the original petition and other actions related to the case. Laura I. Quijano is identified as the respondent, highlighting the adversarial nature of the legal matter.

Status: The case is marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have been completed. The last entries on the docket are from July 7, 2015, which include a notice of judgment and a report, suggesting that the judgment was finalized at that time. All financial assessments and payments were also recorded, further supporting the closure of the case.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to stem from a family law dispute, as indicated by the filing of the "Original Petition" on May 7, 2015. The docket reflects a financial assessment related to the case, suggesting that financial issues may be a significant aspect of the dispute. Further details on the specific claims or factual background are not provided in the docket entries.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case is characterized by the filing of an Original Petition on May 7, 2015, by petitioner Parminder S. Virk, represented by Roderick Dale Marx. The docket reflects various procedural entries, including a waiver on July 3, 2015, and a notice of judgment mailed on July 7, 2015. Roderick Marx's performance as counsel appears to be proactive, as he successfully navigated through the filing and procedural requirements leading to the judgment, although detailed motion specifics are not provided in the entries. Overall, his role seems instrumental in advancing the case through the necessary legal channels.

Duration: The case lasted from May 7, 2015, when the original petition was filed, until it was closed with the notice of judgment mailed on July 7, 2015. This indicates a duration of exactly two months. The case entries reflect all relevant actions taken within this timeframe, culminating in the judgment.

Outcome: The case involving Parminder S. Virk was initiated with the filing of an Original Petition on May 7, 2015, and concluded with a Notice of Judgment mailed on July 7, 2015, indicating a final decision was reached. The docket reflects a waiver filed on July 3, 2015, and a financial assessment showing a total of \$282.00 paid, suggesting compliance with court fees. Overall, the case status is marked as closed, signaling the resolution of the matter.

Complexity: The case is a relatively straightforward divorce without children, indicated by the filing of an original petition and subsequent entries such as a waiver and a prove-up. The docket entries suggest minimal complexity, involving routine procedural steps such as financial assessments and judgment notices. Overall, the case appears to be uncomplicated, with no indications of contested issues or additional complications.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they mention that Roderick Marx hired any experts. The entries primarily reflect procedural actions and financial transactions related to the case.

Monetary value: The case appears to be of minimal monetary significance, as indicated by the total financial assessment of \$282.00, which includes payments and credits totaling the same amount. The docket entries suggest that the case involves family law, but no further monetary claims or damages are specified.

[HABIP KARGIN vs. PATRICIA GODINA](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx served as counsel for the petitioner, Habip Kargin, in this divorce case. The docket reflects that he was actively involved in representing Kargin, who initiated the legal proceedings against the respondent, Patricia Godina.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the "case_status" entry in the docket. The last recorded activities include a waiver of service and a prove-up, suggesting that formal proceedings were completed, likely leading to the closure of the divorce case filed on February 20, 2015. All financial obligations appear to have been settled as well.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on February 20, 2015. The docket reflects that the case was initiated under family law, and the financial information suggests that the petitioner, Habip Kargin, has settled the required court fees. The waiver of service filed on April 30, 2015, indicates that the respondent is aware of the proceedings and has chosen to waive formal service of process.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this family law case involved the filing of an original petition for divorce by Habip Kargin on February 20, 2015, with subsequent entries including a waiver of service on April 30, 2015, and a 'prove up' hearing on May 5, 2015. Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Kargin, indicating an active role in advocating for the client's interests throughout the proceedings. The financial assessment noted a total of \$282.00, which reflects the financial obligations tied to the case, potentially impacting the outcome of the divorce settlement. The docket entries suggest a straightforward motion practice with a focus on compliance with procedural requirements leading to the finalization of the divorce.

Duration: The case commenced on February 20, 2015, with the filing of the original petition for divorce and concluded on May 5, 2015, with the last docket entries indicating proceedings including a waiver of service and a prove up. Thus, the case lasted approximately 2 months and 15 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case, initiated by Habip Kargin with the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on February 20, 2015, progressed through the legal process with a Waiver of Service filed on April 30, 2015, and concluded with a Prove Up hearing on May 5, 2015. The case is now closed, with a total financial assessment of \$282.00 fully paid by the petitioner.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a potentially less complex legal matter compared to cases involving custody or child support issues. The docket entries suggest a straightforward process, with an original petition filed, a waiver of service, and a prove-up indicating that the parties may have reached an agreement. Additionally, the financial information provided is limited, further suggesting a lack of complexity in the financial aspects of the divorce. Overall, this case appears to be relatively simple and procedural in nature.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural matters related to the divorce case and financial assessments.

Monetary value: The case appears to be a divorce proceeding filed by Habip Kargin, with a financial assessment totaling \$282.00, which includes the full amount paid. Since no substantial monetary claims or assets are detailed in the docket, it suggests that the case is relatively minor from a monetary perspective, likely involving limited financial considerations typical of divorce proceedings.

[IN THE MATTER OF THE MARRIAGE OF CHRISTOPHER H. PAYTON AND HEATHER M. PAYTON](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick D. Marx represented the Petitioner, Christopher H. Payton, in the case, which involved a divorce proceeding. The docket entries indicate the progression of the case, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce that was agreed upon. The Respondent in this matter was Heather M. Payton, and there were also two minor children involved, Lucas R. Payton and Wesley B. Payton.

Status: The case has been disposed, indicating that it has concluded. The docket entries include a final decree of divorce, which suggests that all issues have been resolved and the case is officially closed. The last significant activity, the income withholding orders, was filed on the same day as the final decree.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on February 5, 2015. The subsequent entries reflect the progression of the divorce proceedings, culminating in a "Final Decree of Divorce - Agreed" on April 22, 2015, and the implementation of "Income Withholding Orders," suggesting issues related to child support or spousal support obligations. The waiver filed on February 19, 2015, likely pertains to procedural requirements being satisfied by one party.

Motion practice: The docket reveals a sequence of motions primarily related to a divorce case, including an Original Petition for Divorce filed on February 5, 2015, followed by a Waiver on February 19, 2015, and culminating in an Agreed Final Decree of Divorce on April 22, 2015. Notably, there is no specific mention

of Roderick Marx in the entries, thus indicating that his motion performance cannot be assessed from the provided docket details. The Income Withholding Orders also filed on the same day as the Final Decree suggest ongoing financial considerations, but do not implicate Roderick Marx directly. Overall, the motion practice appears to have followed a standard, cooperative trajectory leading to the finalization of the divorce.

Duration: The case lasted from February 5, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, until April 22, 2015, when the final decree of divorce was agreed upon. This results in a duration of approximately 2 months and 17 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case was disposed of following the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on February 5, 2015, and subsequent Waiver on February 19, 2015. An Agreed Final Decree of Divorce was issued on April 22, 2015, which included Income Withholding Orders, indicating that the parties consented to the terms of the divorce and any associated financial obligations.

Complexity: The case involved a divorce proceeding, as indicated by the original petition filed on February 5, 2015, and concluded with a final decree of divorce on April 22, 2015. The presence of a waiver suggests that both parties may have agreed to the terms, leading to a straightforward resolution, evidenced by the agreed final decree. Additionally, the inclusion of income withholding orders indicates that financial obligations were addressed, but overall, the case appears to be relatively uncomplicated and amicable.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that the case involved divorce proceedings, including an original petition, a waiver, and a final decree of divorce, all of which suggest a straightforward divorce process. However, there is no mention of any expert involvement or hiring of experts by Roderick Marx in the case.

Monetary value: The docket indicates that this case involves a divorce proceeding, including a final decree of divorce and income withholding orders, which typically relate to child support or alimony. However, there are no specific monetary amounts mentioned in the entries, making it difficult to estimate the financial stakes involved. Given the nature of divorce cases, a rough estimate could range from several thousand to tens of thousands of dollars, depending on the circumstances.

[LEONARDO GONZALEZ-MANZANO vs. MIQUELA DAVIS](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx served as counsel for the petitioner, Leonardo J. Gonzalez-Manzano, in the case. This indicates that he represented the Plaintiff's interests throughout the proceedings. The respondent in the case is Miquela A. Davis.

Status: The case has been officially closed, as indicated by the case status labeled "CLOSED." The last entries date back to February 3, 2015, which included a report and notice of judgment, suggesting that all court proceedings have been completed. Additional entries reflect actions taken in late 2014, confirming the timeline of events leading to the case's closure.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to involve family law matters, as indicated by the filing of an "ORIGINAL PETITION" under a family case type on December 2, 2014. The docket entries suggest that financial information related to the petitioner, Leonardo J. Gonzalez-Manzano, was assessed, and a waiver was filed, indicating potential issues surrounding financial obligations or support. The subsequent entries reference a hearing and judgment, suggesting that the case progressed towards resolution in court.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily involves the petitioner, Leonardo J. Gonzalez-Manzano, who is represented by Roderick Dale Marx. The docket reflects a series of procedural steps, including the original petition filed on December 2, 2014, and subsequent hearings, notably the prove-up hearing held on February 3, 2015. Marx's performance as counsel is implied through his representation during critical stages of the case, such as the hearing where judgment was issued, indicating his active role in advancing the petitioner's interests throughout the litigation process.

Duration: The case commenced on December 2, 2014, with the filing of the original petition and concluded on February 3, 2015, following the notice of judgment and a hearing. Therefore, the case lasted a total of 63 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case was officially filed on December 2, 2014, with an original petition submitted, and all financial obligations were met by the plaintiff, Leonardo J. Gonzalez-Manzano, amounting to \$285. A waiver was recorded on January 27, 2015, followed by a prove-up hearing held on February 3, 2015, where a judgment was rendered, and a notice of judgment was subsequently mailed the same day. The case has been closed, indicating that all matters have been resolved.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, indicated by the lack of complications such as custody or support issues. The docket entries show a quick progression from the original petition filed on December 2, 2014, to a hearing held on January 27, 2015, culminating in a judgment notice mailed on February 3, 2015. The case closed efficiently with a financial assessment showing no outstanding payments, suggesting minimal disputes or complexities involved.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily document procedural aspects and financial transactions related to the case.

Monetary value: The case appears to be a family law matter involving Leonardo J. Gonzalez-Manzano, with a total financial assessment of \$285.00, which indicates the monetary aspect of the case is relatively small and limited to this amount. The entries reflect a straightforward procedural history, including the filing of an original petition and subsequent hearings, but no additional monetary claims or damages are noted in the docket.

[AMBER JOHNSON vs. ROY JOHNSON](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Amber M. Johnson, in the case. This indicates that he was advocating on behalf of the party initiating the legal action, while Roy L. Johnson was the respondent. The docket entries reflect procedural steps related to the case, with no indication of representation for the respondent.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status listed as "CLOSED." The docket entries date back to 2015, with the most recent activity occurring in 2016, including orders, notices, and reports. The financial information reflects a total assessment and payment of \$333.00 made by the party involved, Amber M. Johnson.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be family law-related, as indicated by the filing of the "Original Petition" and the designation of the case as a family matter. The factual background suggests involvement of financial assessments, with Amber M. Johnson being a party who has made total payments towards a financial obligation, as evidenced by the transaction record dated March 9, 2015.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily involves Roderick Dale Marx, acting as counsel for the petitioner Amber M. Johnson, who filed an original petition on March 6, 2015. The docket reveals various procedural entries, including an order for employers to withhold and a notice of judgment mailed, indicating active litigation and compliance with court orders. Notably, there are financial assessments and transactions associated with Johnson, suggesting that financial aspects were addressed during the proceedings, but the specific performance or motions filed by Roderick Marx are not detailed in the docket entries provided.

Duration: The case began with the filing of the original petition on March 6, 2015, and concluded with the last docket entry on February 9, 2016. Therefore, the case lasted for approximately 10 months and 3 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case was initiated on March 6, 2015, with the filing of an Original Petition in a family law matter. On February 9, 2016, a judgment was issued, leading to an order for employers to withhold funds, and relevant notices and reports were mailed and filed. The financial assessment indicated that Amber M. Johnson paid a total of \$333.00, and the case is now closed.

Complexity: The case is a divorce involving children, which typically introduces complexities related to custody, support, and visitation arrangements. However, the docket entries indicate a straightforward process with a waiver filed and a judgment entered, suggesting minimal contention. The case appears to have been resolved efficiently, as evidenced by the closed status and the lack of extensive litigation or multiple hearings. Overall, it seems relatively uncomplicated compared to more contentious divorce cases.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they specify whether Roderick Marx hired any experts. The entries primarily consist of administrative orders, notices of judgment, and financial information related to the parties involved.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a total financial assessment of \$333.00, with the defendant, Amber M. Johnson, having made a payment of the same amount. This indicates that the monetary aspect of the case is relatively minor, likely revolving around family law issues given the nature of the original petition. There are no entries indicating claims for larger sums or damages.

[ANDRES AGUILAR vs. ANEL VERBER](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Andres Aguilar, in the case. This indicates that his role was to advocate for Aguilar's interests, likely in relation to the divorce proceedings and associated financial matters. The docket entries reflect various motions and orders relevant to child support and financial assessments, highlighting the active nature of the case during the specified timeline.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have concluded. The last docket entry related to financial assessments occurred on 05/02/2017, which aligns with the closure date of the case. Prior entries reflect various motions and orders leading up to the final resolution, suggesting that all necessary legal actions have been taken.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to involve a modification of child support, as indicated by the motion to modify child support filed on May 2, 2017. The case originated from a divorce petition filed on February 20, 2015, and subsequent actions include financial assessments and orders related to the withholding of wages. The docket also reflects a prior dismissal for want of prosecution, suggesting potential procedural complexities in the case's history.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily involved Roderick Dale Marx as counsel for the petitioner, Andres Aguilar, who filed a motion to modify child support on May 2, 2017, which was subsequently agreed upon in an order after judgment on May 3, 2017. The case reflects a procedural history that includes prior dismissal for want of prosecution and culminated in a financial assessment related to the child support obligations, indicating a successful resolution of the modification request. The involvement of the Attorney General as a movant suggests a regulatory oversight in the child support matters. Overall, the motion performance of Roderick Marx was effective in achieving an agreed modification of child support, leading to a closed case status.

Duration: The case lasted from February 20, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, until May 4, 2017, when the final docket entry regarding financial collections was made. This indicates a duration of approximately 2 years and 2 months before the case was marked as closed.

Outcome: The case, initiated with an original petition for divorce on February 20, 2015, progressed through various docket entries, including a waiver of service and a judgment notice mailed on April 28, 2015. A motion to modify child support was agreed upon, leading to an order for employers to withhold support

payments, and the case was eventually closed following an agreed motion on May 3, 2017. Notably, the financial assessments indicate that both parties settled their financial obligations, with a total payment of \$333.00 by Andres Aguilar and an additional charge of \$15.00 to the Attorney General. The case status is marked as closed, indicating finality in the proceedings.

Complexity: The case is a divorce with children, indicating a potential for complexity due to custody and support issues. There are multiple entries regarding child support modifications and financial assessments, suggesting ongoing financial disputes. The case also experienced a dismissal for want of prosecution, which adds a layer of procedural complexity. Overall, while it involves significant legal considerations, the resolution appears to have been reached through agreed orders, indicating some level of cooperation between parties.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural aspects and financial transactions related to the case.

Monetary value: The case appears to be a family law matter involving child support, with financial assessments totaling \$333 for the party named Aguilar and \$15 for the Attorney General. While specific monetary amounts related to the child support obligations are not disclosed, the total assessed amounts suggest that the financial stakes in this case are relatively modest, likely under \$500.

SUZANNE LEE vs. JASON LEE

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Suzanne L. Lee, in the case. The docket entries indicate that he was involved in the legal proceedings on behalf of his client, while Jason W. Lee was listed as the respondent. Additionally, the State of Texas was noted as a movant in the case.

Status: The case is marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have been completed and no further action is expected. The docket entries reflect multiple financial assessments, motions, and hearings leading up to this closure, with the last relevant activity noted in July 2017.

Background: The cause of action in this case involves a modification of child support, as indicated by the motion filed on January 8, 2016. The factual background suggests that the original petition was filed on December 2, 2014, leading to court proceedings regarding financial obligations between the parties, Suzanne L. Lee and Jason W. Lee. Subsequent entries indicate ongoing adjustments and hearings related to the child support payments, highlighting the financial assessments and actions taken by the court to enforce or modify support obligations.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around child support modification, initiated by Suzanne L. Lee through her counsel Roderick Dale Marx, with a motion filed on January 8, 2016, followed by a hearing on January 21, 2016, where an agreed order was subsequently issued. Roderick Marx's performance included effectively representing the petitioner in both the motion to modify and the subsequent hearings, culminating in the resolution of the child support modification issue on January 21, 2016, indicating a successful outcome for his client. The docket also reflects ongoing financial assessments and obligations related to the case, demonstrating the procedural diligence maintained throughout the litigation process.

Duration: The case lasted from its filing on December 2, 2014, until its closure, which is indicated by the last relevant entry on July 11, 2017. This results in a total duration of approximately 2 years and 7 months.

Outcome: The case, which involves child support modification and related financial assessments between Suzanne L. Lee and Jason W. Lee, concluded with an agreement on the post-judgment motion on January 21, 2016, and the case was subsequently closed. The final payments and credits were settled, with Suzanne Lee having a total financial assessment of \$336.00 and Jason Lee assessed at \$15.00, both of which were resolved. The last recorded activity was an update to the case address and payment notifications in 2017, indicating compliance with the court's directives.

Complexity: The case involves a divorce with children, indicating a potentially high level of complexity due to the need to address custody and support issues. The docket entries reflect multiple motions and hearings related to child support modifications and financial assessments, suggesting ongoing disputes. However, the case appears to have been resolved through agreed orders and motions, leading to its closure, which may indicate a relatively straightforward resolution despite its initial complexities.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they mention that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural and financial aspects of the case without reference to expert testimony or consultation.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve child support modification, with financial assessments totaling \$336.00 for Suzanne Lee and \$15.00 for Jason Lee, indicating a relatively small monetary perspective in the overall case. The total financial assessments suggest that the case is not of significant monetary value, likely under \$500.

JESSICA LOFTIS vs. LEKENDRICK LOFTIS

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Jessica Tiony Loftis, in the case. The docket indicates that he was listed as counsel for the petitioner, while the respondent was Lekendrick L. Loftis. The case involved an original petition for divorce filed on February 8, 2016, and the case ultimately ended in dismissal for want of prosecution on September 1, 2016.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status. The last relevant entry was a dismissal for want of prosecution dated 09/01/2016, which confirms the conclusion of the proceedings.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on February 8, 2016. The docket reflects that the case was initiated by Jessica Tiony Loftis, and subsequent entries detail procedural steps such as the issuance and return of service of citation. Ultimately, the case was dismissed for want of prosecution on September 1, 2016, suggesting a failure to advance the case or comply with procedural requirements.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around the Original Petition for Divorce filed by Jessica Tiony Loftis, represented by attorney Roderick Dale Marx. The docket entries indicate a series of procedural steps including the issuance of citations and subsequent return of service, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 1, 2016. Roderick Marx's involvement appears to be limited to the initial filing and subsequent procedural motions, with no indication of further advocacy or responses to the dismissal, reflecting a lack of active engagement in the case as it progressed.

Duration: The case lasted from February 8, 2016, when the original petition for divorce was filed, until it was dismissed for want of prosecution on September 1, 2016. This results in a total duration of approximately 6 months and 24 days. The case was officially closed following the dismissal.

Outcome: The case, initiated on February 8, 2016, with the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce by Jessica Tiony Loftis, ultimately resulted in a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 1, 2016. This indicates that the plaintiff failed to actively pursue the case, leading to its closure, as reflected in the case status marked as "CLOSED." Prior to dismissal, the docket entries show various procedural steps, including the issuance of citations and the return of service, but no substantive progress was made towards adjudication.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward family law matter. The docket entries reflect a series of procedural steps including the filing of the original petition, issuance of citations, and ultimately a dismissal for want of prosecution. The case appears to lack significant complexity, as there are no indications of contested issues or extensive litigation, leading to its closure without further proceedings.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of Roderick Marx hiring experts. The entries primarily focus on procedural aspects of the case, such as filings and judgments.

Monetary value: The case involved a divorce petition filed by Jessica Tiony Loftis, with financial assessments totaling \$300.00, which includes specific transactions of \$292.00 and \$8.00. Given the nature of divorce cases, it's reasonable to estimate that the monetary implications could be in the low thousands, but no specific amount for claims or assets is detailed in the docket. Overall, this appears to be a relatively low-stakes family law matter based on the financial information provided.

[GWENDOLYN DIXON vs. MICHAEL BARREE, SR.](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Gwendolyn E. Dixon, in the case. His involvement is indicated by his name listed as counsel for the petitioner, while the respondent is identified as Michael L. Barree, Sr. The docket reflects key entries related to the case, including the filing of the original petition and financial transactions linked to the case.

Status: The case is marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have concluded and no further legal actions are pending. The last docket entries date back to April 28, 2015, suggesting that the case was finalized around that time. All necessary filings, including a notice of judgment and financial transactions, have been completed. Thus, the matter has been resolved and officially closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be a family law matter initiated by Gwendolyn E. Dixon, as indicated by the filing of the "ORIGINAL PETITION" on February 19, 2015. The docket entries suggest that the case involves financial assessments and payments, but specific details regarding the underlying issues or claims are not provided in the available entries.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case appears to involve the petitioner, Gwendolyn E. Dixon, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, initiating proceedings through an Original Petition filed on February 19, 2015. Subsequent entries indicate procedural steps taken, including a waiver on April 23, 2015, and a "prove up" motion before a judgment was mailed on April 28, 2015. Roderick Marx's performance in these motions seems focused on ensuring compliance with procedural requirements and advocating on behalf of his client to secure a favorable outcome. Overall, the docket entries reflect a structured progression through the necessary legal steps leading to a judgment.

Duration: The case started on February 19, 2015, with the filing of the original petition and related documents. It concluded on April 28, 2015, as indicated by the notice of judgment being mailed and other final entries. Therefore, the case lasted for 70 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case, filed on February 19, 2015, involved Gwendolyn E. Dixon and was processed as a family matter, culminating in a waiver and a prove-up hearing leading to a judgment. A notice of judgment was mailed on April 28, 2015, and the case has since been closed. The total financial assessment for the case was \$282, which was fully paid by Roderick Dale Marx through a credit card transaction.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal matter. The docket entries reflect minimal complexity, with key actions such as filing the original petition, a waiver, and a prove-up, culminating in a judgment notice. The case was filed and resolved within a few months, and there are no indications of disputes or additional complications. Overall, this case appears to be simple and procedural in nature.

Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor does it specify that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily detail administrative actions, financial information, and procedural filings related to the case.

Monetary value: The case appears to be of minimal monetary significance, as indicated by the total financial assessment of only \$282.00, which reflects the total payments and credits associated with the case. No specific claims or damages are mentioned that would suggest a larger monetary dispute. Thus, this case can be roughly estimated to involve a financial amount of approximately \$282.00.

[In the Matter of the Marriage of Brett Allen Hancock and Amanda Leigh Hancock and In the Interest of Brynley M. Hancock and Cameron H. Hancock, Children](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the Petitioner, Brett Allen Hancock, in the case, which involved a divorce proceeding against Amanda Leigh Hancock, the Respondent. The docket entries indicate that the case culminated in a Final Order/Judgment/Decree on May 7, 2015, effectively closing the case.

Status: The case has been marked as "Inactive: Disposed," indicating that it has been closed. The final order was issued on May 7, 2015, which finalized the divorce and effectively concluded all matters within the case. Subsequent entries, such as filing with Records Management, do not imply ongoing litigation.

Background: The cause of action is divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on February 12, 2015. The factual background includes the issuance of a "Final Decree of Divorce" on May 7, 2015, which closed the case, and involved child support arrangements as evidenced by the "Order/Notice to Withhold Income For Child Support."

Motion practice: The docket reflects a series of procedural steps in a divorce case involving parties Amanda Leigh Hancock and Brett Allen Hancock, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on May 7, 2015. There is no specific mention of Roderick Marx in the provided entries, indicating that he may not be actively involved in this particular motion practice. The case features standard motions related to child support, final decrees, and pertinent notices, but lacks any detailed motion performance analysis related to Roderick Marx or significant motion practice details beyond routine filings.

Duration: The case lasted from the filing of the Original Petition for Divorce on February 12, 2015, until the Final Order/Judgment/Decree was issued on May 7, 2015, totaling approximately 84 days.

Outcome: The case resulted in a Final Decree of Divorce on May 7, 2015, between Amanda Leigh Hancock and Brett Allen Hancock, effectively closing the case. Child support arrangements were also established, with notices sent to both parties and the State Disbursement Unit. Following the final order, all records associated with the case were archived on August 17, 2015, marking the case as inactive and disposed.

Complexity: The case appears to be a straightforward divorce proceeding, culminating in a final decree on May 7, 2015, which included child support arrangements and administrative notices. The docket entries indicate routine procedural steps typical of divorce cases, such as notices to the parties, the filing of child support information, and the issuance of a final order, suggesting a lack of significant disputes or complexities. Overall, the matter seems to have been handled efficiently without contentious issues.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate that any experts were involved in the case. Furthermore, there is no mention of Roderick Marx hiring any experts. The case primarily consists of procedural entries related to a divorce and child support matters.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that this case involved a divorce between Amanda Leigh Hancock and Brett Allen Hancock, with child support issues addressed through an Order to Withhold Income. However, there are no specific monetary amounts mentioned in the docket, so it is difficult to provide an exact figure. Given the context of child support and divorce settlements, a rough estimate for such cases typically ranges from several thousand to tens of thousands of dollars, depending on the circumstances.

[JOSE AGUILAR, JR. vs. JOSEFINA AGUILAR](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Jose M. Aguilar, Jr., in the case, which involved a divorce petition filed on January 29, 2015. The case entries reflect various procedural activities, including motions and orders related to attorney representation, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on July 2, 2015.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status. The last significant entry on the docket is a dismissal for want of prosecution dated July 2, 2015, which typically signifies the end of the case. All entries prior to this dismissal are procedural and do not indicate any further actions taken to revive the case.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a petition for divorce, initiated by the Original Petition filed on January 29, 2015, by Jose M. Aguilar, Jr. The docket entries indicate subsequent procedural actions, including motions for withdrawal of counsel and a general denial answer from the opposing party, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on July 2, 2015.

Motion practice: Roderick Dale Marx, representing petitioner Jose M. Aguilar, Jr., filed an Original Petition for Divorce on January 29, 2015. Subsequently, on March 24, 2015, Marx submitted a Motion to Withdraw as Counsel, which was granted in an Order on April 7, 2015. The case ultimately faced a Dismissal for Want of Prosecution on July 2, 2015, indicating a lack of action or follow-through after Marx's withdrawal.

Duration: The case was filed on January 29, 2015, and closed with a dismissal for want of prosecution on July 2, 2015. Therefore, the case lasted a total of 185 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case was initiated on January 29, 2015, with the filing of an original petition for divorce by Jose M. Aguilar, Jr. Subsequently, on March 24, 2015, a motion for withdrawal of counsel was filed, and an order allowing this withdrawal was issued on April 7, 2015. The case was ultimately dismissed for want of prosecution on July 2, 2015, indicating that no further action was taken by the petitioner to advance the case, leading to its closure.

Complexity: The case is a divorce with children, indicating potential complexity due to custody and financial considerations. However, the rapid progression to dismissal for want of prosecution, along with the withdrawal of attorneys and general denial filed by the respondent, suggests a lack of substantive litigation. The case appears to have been relatively straightforward but ultimately unresolved, as indicated by its closed status after minimal activity.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of Roderick Marx hiring experts. The entries primarily focus on procedural aspects of the case, including motions to withdraw counsel and a dismissal for want of prosecution.

Monetary value: The case titled "JOSE AGUILAR, JR. vs. JOSEFINA AGUILAR" appears to be a divorce proceeding, as indicated by the original petition filed on January 29, 2015. The financial information shows a total assessment of \$333.00, which likely reflects court fees rather than the monetary stakes involved in the divorce itself. Given the nature of divorce cases, if an estimate were to be made regarding potential monetary issues like asset division or alimony, it would be speculative, but typically such cases can range from thousands to millions, depending on the assets at stake. However, no specific monetary claims or amounts are detailed in the docket entries.

[ROSA LINDA BRYANT vs. ERIC BRYANT](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Rosa Linda N. Bryant, in the case. The docket entries indicate that he was involved in the proceedings alongside his client, while Eric D. Bryant was identified as the respondent.

Status: The case has been concluded and is marked as "CLOSED." The last docket entries indicate final actions taken on September 1, 2015, including the mailing of a judgment notice and a "PROVE UP," which typically signifies the conclusion of proceedings. All relevant financial assessments have been settled, indicating no outstanding issues remain.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be related to family law, as indicated by the "NEW CASE FILED (OCA) - FAMILY" entry. The initiating document is the "ORIGINAL PETITION" filed on May 6, 2015, suggesting the commencement of a legal action by Rosa Linda N. Bryant, though the specific claims and factual background are not detailed in the docket entries provided. Additionally, a waiver was filed on August 27, 2015, which may imply an agreement or concession pertaining to the proceedings.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily involved the petitioner, Rosa Linda N. Bryant, represented by Roderick Dale Marx. Key docket entries include the filing of the original petition and related motions, with a notable date being the waiver filed on August 27, 2015, which indicates a procedural step in advancing the case. Additionally, the judgment notice sent on September 1, 2015, signifies the conclusion of the motion practice, suggesting that the motions filed by Marx were ultimately successful in achieving the desired outcome for his client.

Duration: The case was filed on May 6, 2015, and was closed on September 1, 2015, indicating a duration of approximately 4 months and 26 days from start to finish. Key docket entries include the original petition and case filing on the initiation date, with significant activities occurring in late August and early September, culminating in a notice of judgment mailed on September 1, 2015.

Outcome: The case was filed on May 6, 2015, by Rosa Linda N. Bryant, with an original petition submitted and a financial assessment of \$333.00, which was fully paid. A waiver was noted on August 27, 2015, and the case culminated with a judgment notice mailed on September 1, 2015, followed by a "prove up" entry on the same day, indicating the case reached a resolution. The case status is marked as closed, suggesting that all matters have been settled or concluded.

Complexity: The case is a divorce with children, indicating potential complexities related to custody and child support. However, the docket entries suggest a straightforward process, with key filings such as the original petition and waiver, and a judgment issued without apparent dispute. The financial aspect appears to be settled promptly, further indicating a lack of contentious issues. Overall, the case seems to have been managed efficiently and closed without significant complications.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor do they mention that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily consist of procedural documents and financial information related to Rosa Linda N. Bryant.

Monetary value: The case appears to be relatively small from a monetary perspective, with a total financial assessment of \$333.00, which was fully paid by the petitioner, Rosa Linda N. Bryant. There are no indications of larger claims or damages specified in the docket entries, suggesting that this is likely a minor family law matter.

[GARY DAVIS vs. SUZANA VIRIC](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx served as counsel for the petitioner, Gary D. Davis, in the case concerning a divorce. His involvement indicates that he represented the interests of the plaintiff in this family law matter.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all legal proceedings have concluded. The docket entries detail various filings related to a divorce, including petitions and waivers, all dated from late 2014 to early 2015. There are no recent entries suggesting ongoing activity, confirming the case's closure.

Background: The cause of action in this case is divorce, as indicated by the filing of the Original Petition for Divorce on December 22, 2014, followed by an Amended Petition on January 15, 2015. The docket reflects the proceedings related to the dissolution of marriage between the parties, with Gary D. Davis listed as the petitioner. The case has been initiated in the family law context, as seen in the docket's classification.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this divorce case initiated by Gary D. Davis, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, includes an original petition filed on December 22, 2014, followed by an amended petition on January 15, 2015, which suggests a strategic refinement of claims or issues at hand. The subsequent entries indicate a waiver of service on February 18, 2015, and a prove-up scheduled on February 27, 2015, signaling progress toward resolution. Roderick Marx's performance appears proactive, as he has taken steps to amend the petition and ensure timely procedural compliance, demonstrating diligence in representing his client's interests.

Duration: The case began on December 22, 2014, with the filing of the original petition for divorce and was subsequently closed after various entries, the last of which occurred on February 27, 2015. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately two months and five days.

Outcome: The case, initiated with the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on December 22, 2014, progressed through various docket entries culminating in the filing of an Amended Petition for Divorce on January 15, 2015. A Waiver of Service was recorded on February 18, 2015, indicating the defendant's acceptance of the proceedings without formal service. The docket entries concluded with a "REPORT TO AUSTIN" and a "PROVE UP" on February 27, 2015, signifying that the case was likely finalized and all necessary documents were submitted for judicial review. The case is marked as closed, with all financial assessments completed and payments made.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicated by the filing of both an original petition and an amended petition. The entries suggest a straightforward process, with a waiver of service and a prove-up hearing, leading to a closed status. The financial assessment appears to be routine, indicating no complexity in financial disputes. Overall, the case seems to be relatively simple and resolved efficiently.

Experts: The docket does not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor does it specify that Roderick Marx hired any experts. The entries primarily focus on procedural aspects of a divorce case, including petitions and waivers, with no mention of expert testimony or consultation.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce proceeding, as indicated by the entries related to the original and amended petitions for divorce. The only specific monetary amount noted in the docket is a financial assessment totaling \$285. This suggests that the case may not be substantial in terms of monetary claims, at least based on the available information. No larger monetary disputes or settlements are referenced, so a rough estimate of the financial stakes might be minimal, possibly around or below the assessed amount.

[SHAE THIESSEN vs. LEO SPANN, JR.](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx served as counsel for the petitioner, Shae E. Thiessen, in the case. This indicates that he was representing the Plaintiff in the legal proceedings. The opposing party, Leo Spann Jr., was represented by R. Travis Cross.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status listed as "CLOSED." The last significant docket entry on 06/17/2022 shows an order for dismissal for want of prosecution, suggesting no further proceedings are pending.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be a modification of a child support order, as evidenced by multiple motions to modify child support and medical support filed by the parties involved, specifically Leo Spann Jr. and Shae Thiessen. The factual background includes a divorce petition filed on February 20, 2015, followed by various hearings, enforcement motions, and financial assessments related to child support obligations, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on June 17, 2022.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around child support and modification motions, with Roderick Dale Marx representing the petitioner, Shae E. Thiessen. A notable motion on 09/27/2021 requested to modify the child support order, which reflects ongoing concerns regarding financial obligations. The motion was later dismissed for want of prosecution on 06/17/2022, indicating a lack of action or follow-through on the part of the petitioner after the initial filing. Throughout the proceedings, various status hearings and enforcement motions were conducted, demonstrating a complex litigation process involving financial assessments and compliance issues.

Duration: The case lasted from February 20, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, until June 17, 2022, when the order for dismissal for want of prosecution was entered, totaling approximately 7 years and 4 months.

Outcome: The case concluded with a dismissal for want of prosecution on June 17, 2022, following a series of motions and hearings related to child support modifications and enforcement. Prior to dismissal, a motion to modify the child support was filed on September 27, 2021, but the case saw multiple status hearings and an order for non-suit, indicating a lack of progress. The docket reflects various procedural actions dating back to the original petition for divorce filed on February 20, 2015, ultimately leading to the case being closed.

Complexity: The case involved a divorce with children and included multiple motions regarding child support and modifications, as indicated by the numerous status hearings and orders related to post-judgment issues. The repeated filings for enforcement and modifications suggest an ongoing complexity surrounding child custody and financial support matters. However, the dismissal for want of prosecution indicates a lack of progress in the case, potentially simplifying its resolution. Overall, while the case had elements of complexity due to its nature and history, it ultimately did not proceed to a substantive resolution.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on motions, orders, and hearings related to child support and modification, without reference to expert testimony or evaluations.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate this case involved child support modifications and enforcement, but no specific monetary amount is detailed in the entries. The financial assessments show payments made by the parties totaling \$333.00 from Shae Thiessen and \$61.00 from Leo Spann, suggesting a relatively small financial dispute, likely in the lower range of thousands of dollars. Overall, without a specific claim amount, a rough estimate of the case value could be inferred to be below \$5,000.

[BERNARD BREWER vs. NADINE BREWER](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Bernard Brewer, in the case. The docket entries indicate that he was involved in filing the original petition and subsequent proceedings related to the case. The respondent in the matter was Nadine Brewer, who had no listed counsel.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have concluded. The last docket entry related to the case dates back to January 29, 2016, which includes a request for payment, suggesting that financial matters relevant to the case have been addressed. Prior entries show a dismissal for want of prosecution, affirming that the case was not actively pursued before its closure.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to stem from a family law matter initiated by the filing of an Original Petition on January 5, 2015. The docket indicates that there was a request for payment, and the case faced dismissal for want of prosecution on August 6, 2015, suggesting potential issues with the prosecution of the claims made in the petition. Financial assessments related to the case were also documented, indicating that the petitioner, Bernard Brewer, had made payments totaling \$282.00.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily involved the petitioner, Bernard Brewer, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, who initiated the legal proceedings with an Original Petition filed on January 5, 2015. The docket reveals a series of procedural developments, including a waiver on April 1, 2015, and a report to Austin on April 7, 2015, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on August 6, 2015, which indicates a lack of action or follow-through by the petitioner. Roderick Marx's motion performance appears limited, as the case concluded without further substantive motions or hearings that may have advanced the petitioner's interests.

Duration: The case was initiated on January 5, 2015, with the filing of the original petition and closed following a dismissal for want of prosecution on August 6, 2015. Thus, the case lasted approximately 7 months and 1 day from start to finish.

Outcome: The case, initiated by Bernard Brewer with the filing of an original petition on January 5, 2015, ultimately faced dismissal for want of prosecution on August 6, 2015, indicating a failure to proceed with the case. Prior to dismissal, a waiver was executed on April 1, 2015, and a judgment notice was mailed on April 8, 2015, following a prove-up session. As of January 29, 2016, a request for payment was filed, but the case status is marked as closed, indicating no further actions were taken post-dismissal.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, indicated by its classification and the limited number of docket entries. Key entries include the original petition filed on January 5, 2015, and a waiver, suggesting an uncontested nature. The case faced a dismissal for want of prosecution, but ultimately concluded with a notice of judgment and a request for payment, highlighting a lack of complexity in legal issues or disputes. The case status is closed, indicating resolution.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of Roderick Marx hiring experts. The entries primarily consist of procedural filings and financial transactions related to the case.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a total financial assessment of \$282.00, which is the only specific monetary amount indicated in the docket entries. It seems that the case was related to a family matter, and the financial assessment likely pertains to court fees or costs associated with the proceedings. There are no indications of a larger monetary claim or damages sought in the documents provided.

[BASHIR THOMPSON vs. KELLY WALKER](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Bashir R. Thompson, in the case involving an original petition for divorce. The docket entries indicate that he is associated with the party initiating the legal action, while the respondent is Kelly A. Walker.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status metadata. The docket entries reflect various procedural actions taken between February and April 2015, culminating in the closure of the case. All relevant filings and financial transactions are documented within this timeframe, but no further actions appear to have occurred after the closure status was recorded.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, initiated by Bashir R. Thompson through the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on February 12, 2015. The docket indicates that the case is categorized under family law, and it includes procedural entries such as citations issued and waivers of service, reflecting the progression of the divorce proceedings.

Motion practice: The case involves a divorce petition filed by Bashir R. Thompson, represented by attorney Roderick Dale Marx, on February 12, 2015. The motion practice primarily includes the issuance and service of citations, with a waiver of service filed on April 23, 2015, indicating the respondent, Kelly A. Walker, was not contesting the service. The docket reflects a straightforward procedural progression with no contested motions or significant disputes noted, suggesting an uncontentious divorce process.

Duration: The case was filed on February 12, 2015, and closed on April 28, 2015, indicating it lasted a total of 2 months and 16 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case, initiated by Bashir R. Thompson with an Original Petition for Divorce filed on February 12, 2015, progressed through various procedural steps, including the issuance of citations and a waiver of service. The docket indicates that the case was ultimately resolved, as evidenced by the "CLOSED" status, following a prove-up session on April 28, 2015, which typically suggests that a final decree was granted. Financial assessments show that the total fees were paid in full, indicating compliance with court requirements.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, indicating a relatively low level of complexity. Key filings include the original petition for divorce, waiver of service, and subsequent procedural steps like citation issuance and prove-up. The case appears to have been efficiently processed, culminating in a closed status without any notable complications or disputes evident from the docket entries.

Experts: The docket does not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor does it specify that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily relate to procedural matters, including the filing of the original petition for divorce and financial assessments.

Monetary value: The case is a divorce proceeding filed by Bashir R. Thompson, with total financial assessments indicating fees totaling \$290.00, which suggests the case is likely of a smaller monetary value in terms of contested assets or alimony. There are no specific claims for damages or substantial amounts indicated in the docket, so a rough estimate of the monetary stakes would be limited to the fees and costs associated with the divorce process itself.

[ADRIANA CAMPUZANO vs. ELIACIN CAMPUZANO](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx represented the petitioner, Adriana Campuzano, in the case, which involves an original petition for divorce. The docket indicates that he is the counsel for the plaintiff, while Eliacin Campuzano is listed as the respondent.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status. The docket entries show a series of filings related to a divorce, including an original petition and a waiver of service, culminating in financial assessments and payments. All relevant actions occurred between February and June 2015, leading to the conclusion of the case.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on February 12, 2015. The initiating document suggests that the petitioner, Adriana Campuzano, has likely initiated proceedings to dissolve her marriage, which involves financial assessments and payment of court fees totaling \$333. The case was filed under the family law category.

Motion practice: The docket entries indicate that the case initiated on February 12, 2015, with Adriana Campuzano filing an Original Petition for Divorce against Eliacin Campuzano, with Roderick Dale Marx serving as her attorney. The motion practice appears minimal, with a Waiver of Service filed on April 30, 2015, and a Prove Up session noted on June 23, 2015, suggesting that Roderick Marx's performance focused primarily on ensuring procedural compliance and progressing the divorce proceedings towards resolution.

Duration: The case began on February 12, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, and it closed on June 23, 2015, marking a duration of approximately four months. Key entries include a waiver of service on April 30, 2015, and various docket activities on June 23, 2015, indicating the case's progression through required legal steps before closure.

Outcome: The case, initiated by Adriana Campuzano with an original petition for divorce filed on February 12, 2015, concluded with a closed status. The financial assessment indicated a total fee of \$333.00, which was fully paid on the same day. Subsequent entries included a waiver of service and a prove-up on June 23, 2015, indicating that the necessary legal proceedings were completed and finalized.

Complexity: The case is a divorce with children, initiated with an original petition filed on February 12, 2015, and concluded with a prove-up on June 23, 2015. It involved a waiver of service and had a straightforward financial assessment indicating a modest total payment of \$333. The docket entries suggest minimal complexity, likely resolving without significant disputes or complications. The case status is marked as closed, indicating finality in the proceedings.

Experts: The docket entries do not mention any experts involved in the case, nor do they indicate that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The contents primarily focus on procedural matters such as the filing of the original petition for divorce and related financial assessments.

Monetary value: The case involves a divorce petition filed by Adriana Campuzano, with a total financial assessment of \$333.00 noted in the docket. The financial information indicates that this amount was fully paid, suggesting that the monetary aspect of the case is relatively minor, likely not exceeding this amount.

[SHERRI HAGMANN vs. GREGORY HAGMANN](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx served as legal counsel for the petitioner, Sherri M. Hagmann, in the case, which involves an original petition for divorce. The docket indicates that he is not representing the respondent, Gregory G. Hagmann.

Status: The case has finished and is officially marked as "CLOSED." The docket entries indicate various filings and transactions related to a divorce proceeding, with the last activity recorded on March 26, 2015. The financial assessment shows that all fees have been paid in full, further confirming the case's closure.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on January 8, 2015. The factual background suggests that Sherri M. Hagmann is seeking a divorce, and the case was initiated in the family court, with relevant financial assessments indicating a filing fee payment of \$282.00.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case focuses primarily on the divorce proceedings initiated by Sherri M. Hagmann, with Roderick Dale Marx serving as her counsel. Key docket entries include the original petition for divorce filed on January 8, 2015, and subsequent motions such as the waiver of service and the report to Austin. Roderick Marx's performance as counsel is indicated by his active role in the initial filings and procedural actions, demonstrating commitment to advancing his client's interests in the family court. The financial assessment also suggests attention to the financial implications of the case, which is crucial in divorce proceedings.

Duration: The case was initiated on January 8, 2015, with the filing of the original petition for divorce and officially closed after various proceedings, including a report and waiver of service, culminating on March 26, 2015. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately 78 days.

Outcome: The case, filed as an Original Petition for Divorce by Sherri M. Hagmann on January 8, 2015, has been closed with a final resolution. Key procedural steps included a waiver of service on March 18, 2015, a prove-up hearing on March 24, 2015, and a report submitted to Austin on March 26, 2015. Financial assessments indicated a total fee of \$282.00, which was fully paid by the petitioner. The judicial officer assigned to the case was Judge James Martin.

Complexity: The case involves a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal issue. Key docket entries include the filing of the original petition, a waiver of service, and a prove-up, all of which suggest minimal complexity and likely an uncontested matter. The case has been closed, reflecting a resolution without significant legal disputes or complications.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor do they specify that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily document procedural aspects of a divorce case, including petitions and financial assessments.

Monetary value: The case appears to be a family law matter, specifically an original petition for divorce filed by Sherri M. Hagmann. The financial information indicates a total financial assessment of \$282.00, which likely relates to court fees rather than the monetary value of the divorce settlement itself. Therefore, no specific monetary amount for the case is provided, but it can be estimated that the financial stakes in the divorce could be more substantial, potentially involving division of assets, alimony, or child support, which are not detailed in the docket.

[In The Matter Of The Marriage of Serena K. Brereton and Travis E. Brereton](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick D. Marx represented the Plaintiff, Serena K. Brereton, in the case. The docket indicates that he was listed as counsel for the Petitioner, while Travis E. Brereton was the Respondent. The case involved a dismissal, as noted in the docket entries, which may reflect on the outcome of the representation.

Status: The case has been disposed, indicating that it has finished and been closed. The latest docket entries include a dismissal on April 8, 2016, and an order dated April 19, 2016. The initial filing occurred on July 7, 2015. All relevant activities suggest that no further actions are pending in this matter.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to stem from the Plaintiff's Original Petition filed on July 7, 2015, although the specific claims or legal theories are not detailed in the docket entries. The case was subsequently dismissed on April 8, 2016, indicating that it did not proceed to a substantive hearing or trial. The docket does not provide further factual background or context regarding the nature of the dispute or the relief sought by the plaintiff.

Motion practice: The docket reflects a series of motions culminating in a dismissal; the case initiated on July 7, 2015, with the filing of the Plaintiff's Original Petition, followed by a Notice on March 10, 2016. The dismissal was finalized on April 8, 2016, during a scheduled dismissal docket, indicating that the court resolved the matter without further proceedings. Notably, there is no specific mention of Roderick Marx in the docket entries, suggesting that he may not have played a significant role in the motion practice or case resolution.

Duration: The case lasted from July 7, 2015, when it was filed, until April 8, 2016, when it was dismissed, resulting in a total duration of approximately 9 months and 1 day. Key entries included the filing of the Plaintiff's Original Petition and the eventual dismissal of the case.

Outcome: The case, initiated on July 7, 2015, with the filing of the Plaintiff's Original Petition, was ultimately dismissed on April 8, 2016, during a dismissal docket hearing. An order related to the dismissal was issued on April 19, 2016. The case is marked as disposed, indicating that no further legal proceedings will take place.

Complexity: The case involves a divorce without children, indicating a simpler legal context as child custody and support issues are absent. The docket entries show a relatively straightforward process, with the case initiated by a petition in July 2015, a notice on March 10, 2016, and ultimately a dismissal on April 8, 2016, suggesting that the matter was resolved without extensive litigation or complexity. Overall, this case appears to lack significant legal complications.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily reflect procedural actions, including a dismissal and original petition filings, without reference to expert testimony or reports.

Monetary value: The docket entries do not specify any monetary amount associated with the case, and the nature of the complaint is not detailed. Given that the case was dismissed, it is unclear whether there was a claim for damages or any specific monetary relief sought. Therefore, without further information, it is difficult to estimate the financial stakes involved in this case.

[RUSSELL PEREZ vs. JOANNA PEREZ](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Russell J. Perez, in the case, which involved an original petition for divorce filed on December 22, 2014. The case ultimately faced a dismissal for want of prosecution on July 9, 2015, indicating a lack of sufficient action by the petitioner to advance the case.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status being marked as "CLOSED." The last docket entry, dated 07/09/2015, reflects a dismissal for want of prosecution, which suggests that the case did not proceed to resolution through active litigation. All relevant filings and entries leading up to the dismissal have been documented, confirming that the matter is no longer active.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the filing of an "Original Petition for Divorce" on December 22, 2014. The docket reflects that this was initiated in the family court, and there were subsequent entries regarding waivers of service and financial assessments related to the case. Ultimately, the case was dismissed for want of prosecution on July 9, 2015, suggesting a lack of progress or action taken by the petitioner after the initial filing.

Motion practice: In the case involving Russell J. Perez as the petitioner and Joanna B. Perez as the respondent, Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner. The docket reflects a series of procedural entries culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on 07/09/2015, indicating a lack of action or follow-through in the case. Notably, there are no motions filed by Marx or any recorded hearings, suggesting that his performance in motion practice may have been minimal or ineffective in advancing the case. The initial filings date back to December 22, 2014, with the case entering a state of stagnation leading to dismissal.

Duration: The case lasted from its filing date on December 22, 2014, until its dismissal for want of prosecution on July 9, 2015. This indicates a duration of approximately 6 months and 17 days. The case status is marked as closed.

Outcome: The case filed by Russell J. Perez for divorce was ultimately dismissed for want of prosecution on July 9, 2015, indicating that the plaintiff failed to pursue the matter actively. Prior docket entries reveal that the original petition was filed on December 22, 2014, and a waiver of service was executed shortly thereafter. The case was closed without any further proceedings or resolutions being recorded.

Complexity: The case involves a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal issue. The docket entries suggest minimal complexity, as the proceedings included a waiver of service, a prove-up, and ultimately a dismissal for want of prosecution. The case was opened in December 2014 and closed by July 2015, suggesting limited active litigation. Overall, the nature of the filings and the case's eventual dismissal indicate it was not a complex matter.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural aspects, such as the dismissal for want of prosecution, the filing of the original petition for divorce, and the waiver of service. No information regarding expert testimony or consultations is present.

Monetary value: This case appears to be a family law matter, specifically a divorce, as indicated by the original petition filed on December 22, 2014. The only financial information provided reflects a total assessment of \$285.00, which suggests that this was a relatively low-stakes case from a monetary perspective. There is no indication of any claims or disputes involving larger sums, thus the case can be roughly estimated to involve minimal financial implications.

[In the Matter of the Marriage of Brandi B. Williams and Derrick L. Williams](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx served as counsel for the Petitioner in the case, representing Brandi Brook Mathes and Brandi B. Williams in their divorce proceedings against Derrick L. Williams, the Respondent.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the Final Order/Judgment/Decree dated March 10, 2016, which states that it closes the entire case. The status of the case is marked as "Inactive: Disposed," confirming that all proceedings have concluded. Additionally, the file has been sent to Records Management for storage, further indicating that no further actions are pending.

Background: The cause of action in this case was a divorce, initiated by Brandi Brook Mathes against Derrick L. Williams, as evidenced by the Original Petition for Divorce filed on June 29, 2015. The case culminated in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on March 10, 2016, which closed the case and confirmed that the parties had reached a resolution without contest.

Motion practice: The docket entries indicate that the motion practice in this case was relatively straightforward, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce issued by Judge Margaret Barnes on March 10, 2016, which closed the case. Roderick Marx's performance is not explicitly detailed in the entries, as there is no mention of his involvement or any motions filed by him; the case appears to have proceeded without significant contest, as evidenced by the waiver of service by Derrick L. Williams and the absence of recorded disputes.

Duration: The case began with the filing of the Original Petition for Divorce on June 29, 2015, and concluded with the Final Order/Judgment/Decree on March 10, 2016. Therefore, the case lasted for approximately 8 months and 11 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case was a divorce proceeding between Brandi Brook Mathes and Derrick L. Williams, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce issued by Judge Margaret Barnes on March 10, 2016, which closed the case. The final order was followed by the necessary notifications to the parties involved and the Bureau of Vital Statistics. The case is now classified as inactive and disposed, with all relevant documents filed and stored appropriately.

Complexity: The case appears to be a straightforward divorce proceeding, culminating in a final decree issued on March 10, 2016, with no indications of contested issues or complexities, as evidenced by the judicial entry noting a "prove up of divorce" with no record. The timeline shows minimal activity, suggesting that the case was relatively simple and resolved without significant dispute or legal complications.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they suggest that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily detail procedural steps related to the divorce proceedings between Derrick L. Williams and Brandi Brook Mathes, with no mention of expert witnesses or reports.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce proceeding between Brandi Brook Mathes and Derrick L. Williams, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on March 10, 2016. There are no specific monetary claims or amounts mentioned in the docket entries, suggesting that this is likely a case of personal rather than financial dispute, making it difficult to estimate a monetary value. Given the nature of divorce cases, if any financial disputes were present, they might pertain to asset division or alimony, but these are not detailed in the available entries. Therefore, a rough estimate regarding the monetary perspective is not applicable based on the provided information.

[In the Matter of the Marriage of Lena M. Crawford and Leonard E. Smith](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the Petitioner, Lena M. Crawford, in the divorce case against Respondent Leonard E. Smith. The docket entries indicate that the case concluded with a Final Decree of Divorce granted to Crawford after a default judgment, where Marx was present as her counsel.

Status: The case has been concluded, as indicated by the Final Order/Judgment/Decree issued on June 11, 2015, which closed the entire case. The current case status is marked as "Inactive: Disposed," confirming that no further action is pending.

Background: The cause of action in this case is divorce, initiated by Lena M. Crawford against Leonard E. Smith, as evidenced by the Original Petition for Divorce filed on March 10, 2015. The factual background indicates that Crawford sought a divorce by default due to the inability to serve Smith personally, leading to a citation by posting after efforts to locate him failed. The court ultimately granted the divorce on June 11, 2015, finalizing the matter with a decree.

Motion practice: The docket entries reveal that Roderick Marx, representing Lena M. Crawford, engaged in several key motions, primarily focused on obtaining a divorce from Leonard E. Smith. The motion practice included filing an Original Petition for Divorce, followed by a Request for Issuance of Citation, and an Affidavit for Citation by Publication or Posting, due to difficulties in serving Smith directly. Ultimately, the court granted a Final Decree of Divorce, which was achieved by default, indicating that Smith did not contest the proceedings, and the record of the divorce was waived. Roderick Marx's performance was characterized by strategic filings to ensure the divorce was finalized despite challenges in service.

Duration: The case lasted from March 10, 2015, when the Original Petition for Divorce was filed, until June 11, 2015, when the Final Order/Judgment/Decree was issued, totaling a duration of approximately two months and one day.

Outcome: The case involved a divorce proceeding between Lena M. Crawford and Leonard E. Smith, culminating in a final decree of divorce issued by Judge Brody Shanklin on June 11, 2015, after a default judgment was granted due to Leonard Smith's failure to respond. The court noted that service was accomplished through citation by posting, as the last known address for Smith was unavailable, and the case was subsequently marked inactive and disposed of on July 30, 2015. The court's orders included sending notices to the parties and filing necessary documents with the Bureau of Vital Statistics, effectively closing the matter.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal matter. The docket entries suggest a default divorce granted after the petitioner, Lena M. Crawford, successfully proved her case without the respondent, Leonard E. Smith, being present, as evidenced by citation by posting and not having an address for direct service. The proceedings were concluded with a final decree and no contested issues noted, demonstrating a low level of complexity.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they suggest that Roderick Marx hired any experts. The focus of the entries pertains primarily to procedural matters related to the divorce proceedings between Lena M. Crawford and Leonard E. Smith.

Monetary value: The case appears to be a divorce proceeding between Lena M. Crawford and Leonard E. Smith, culminating in a final decree of divorce. There is no indication of any monetary claims or disputes regarding property division, alimony, or child support in the docket entries, suggesting that the case may not have involved significant financial implications. Therefore, it is reasonable to estimate that the monetary aspect of this case is minimal or potentially negligible.

[CHESTER SHERMAN vs. SHERI EVANS SHERMAN](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx served as counsel for the petitioner, Chester L. Sherman, in the case, which involves an original petition for divorce filed on January 5, 2015. The respondent in the case is Sheri Y. Evans Sherman.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status. The docket entries reflect various procedural actions related to a divorce petition filed on January 5, 2015, with subsequent entries up until March 24, 2015. All financial assessments and payments have been accounted for, confirming the case's resolution.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on January 5, 2015. The docket entries reflect the initiation of a family law case, with the petitioner being Chester L. Sherman, who has completed a financial assessment related to the proceedings. The waiver of service suggests that the respondent may have agreed to the terms without contest.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around the divorce proceedings initiated by Chester L. Sherman against Sheri Y. Evans Sherman, with Roderick Dale Marx serving as the petitioner's counsel. The docket indicates a waiver of service on March 18, 2015, followed by a prove-up on March 24, 2015, suggesting that the case is progressing towards resolution without contested proceedings. Roderick Marx's performance appears to be focused on ensuring procedural compliance and facilitating the divorce process efficiently, with key filings made on January 5, 2015, marking the initiation of the case.

Duration: The case lasted from January 5, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, until it was officially closed, which is implied but not explicitly stated in the docket. The last relevant entries occurred on March 24, 2015, indicating significant activity during that time. Therefore, the duration of the case from filing to closure is approximately 2 months and 19 days.

Outcome: The case involved Chester L. Sherman filing an original petition for divorce on January 5, 2015, which was classified under family law. A waiver of service was recorded on March 18, 2015, indicating that the other party may have consented to the proceedings. On March 24, 2015, the case reached a "prove up" stage, suggesting that the divorce was finalized and the case is now closed. The financial assessment shows that all fees of \$282.00 were paid in full.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal matter. The docket entries show that the original petition was filed, a waiver of service was issued, and the case was ultimately closed with a prove-up, suggesting that both parties likely agreed to the terms. The financial assessment indicates a minimal fee was involved, further supporting the simplicity of the proceedings. Overall, this case appears to be low in complexity and likely resolved amicably.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they mention that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural aspects of the divorce case and financial assessments.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that the case is a divorce proceeding filed by Chester L. Sherman, and there is a total financial assessment of \$282.00, which corresponds to the court fees paid. However, there is no specific information regarding the monetary value of the divorce settlement or claims involved in the case. Given the nature of divorce cases, the financial stakes could vary widely, but based on the information provided, the case appears to be minor in terms of financial assessment.

[HUGO VALDEZ vs. VERONICA VALDEZ](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx served as the counsel for the petitioner, Hugo S. Valdez, in the case. This indicates that he represented the interests of the plaintiff rather than the defendant, Veronica Valdez.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the docket's case status. The final entry shows a dismissal for want of prosecution on May 7, 2015, which suggests that the case was not actively pursued thereafter. The financial assessment and payments recorded earlier in the docket support the conclusion that the case has concluded.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be related to family law, as indicated by the "ORIGINAL PETITION" filed on October 14, 2014, which likely pertains to issues such as custody, support, or divorce. The docket also includes a dismissal for want of prosecution on May 7, 2015, suggesting that the case may have been inactive or unpursued by the plaintiff, Hugo S. Valdez. Additionally, there are several entries regarding financial assessments and payments, indicating a financial component to the proceedings, but specifics on the factual background are not detailed in the docket entries provided.

Motion practice: In the case involving Hugo S. Valdez as the petitioner, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, the motion practice appears minimal, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on May 7, 2015. Prior to that, various procedural orders and reports were filed on January 6, 2015, indicating some level of activity, but ultimately, the case was closed without significant movement on the merits or a clear indication of the arguments presented by Marx. The timeline reflects that after the original petition was filed on October 14, 2014, there was a lack of follow-up leading to the court's dismissal.

Duration: The case began on October 14, 2014, with the filing of the original petition and was closed with a dismissal for want of prosecution on May 7, 2015. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately 6 months and 23 days.

Outcome: The case involving Hugo S. Valdez was ultimately dismissed for want of prosecution on May 7, 2015, indicating that the court found insufficient action taken to advance the case. Prior to dismissal, various motions and reports were filed, including orders for employers to withhold and financial assessments, with all fees paid by the petitioner totaling \$336. The case status is now marked as closed.

Complexity: The case is a divorce with children, which inherently presents complexities due to the involvement of minors and potential custody issues. However, the docket entries indicate a lack of substantive progress, with a dismissal for want of prosecution and minimal activity, suggesting that the case did not advance beyond initial filings. The financial information reflects a straightforward assessment, but the overall case status is closed without resolution, indicating limited

complexity in proceedings.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they show that Roderick Marx hired any experts. The case primarily consists of procedural entries, including dismissals and orders, without mention of expert testimony or involvement.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a financial assessment of \$336.00 associated with the party Hugo S. Valdez, which indicates that the monetary aspect of the case is relatively small. There is no indication of larger claims or damages in the docket entries, suggesting that this case was minor from a monetary perspective.

[ANNA AMRINE vs. RONNELL AMRINE, SR.](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Anna L. Amrine, in the case, which involved an original petition for divorce. The respondent in the case was Ronnell W. Amrine, Sr.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have concluded. The docket entries reflect various stages of the divorce process, with the original petition filed on January 22, 2015, and a waiver of service noted shortly thereafter. The final entry on March 31, 2015, suggests that the case was finalized with a "prove up," consistent with typical divorce proceedings.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a petition for divorce filed by Anna L. Amrine on January 22, 2015. The initiating document indicates the commencement of a family law matter, seeking the dissolution of marriage, with an associated financial assessment of \$282.00 for court fees.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case appears limited, with key entries including a waiver of service and a prove-up related to the original petition for divorce filed by Anna L. Amrine, represented by Roderick Dale Marx. Roderick Marx's performance in this context may reflect a strategic approach aimed at efficiently progressing the divorce proceedings, possibly focusing on ensuring compliance from the respondent, Ronnell W. Amrine, Sr. Notably, the docket indicates the financial assessment related to the case, which may be pertinent in the context of divorce settlements or negotiations.

Duration: The case was filed on January 22, 2015, with the original petition for divorce. It was actively processed with entries until March 31, 2015, when the final docket sheet and prove-up occurred. Therefore, the case lasted from January 22, 2015, to March 31, 2015, totaling approximately two months and nine days. The case status is now closed.

Outcome: The case, initiated by Anna L. Amrine with the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on January 22, 2015, progressed through a waiver of service and concluded with a prove-up on March 31, 2015. Financial assessments were recorded, with a total payment of \$282.00 made by the petitioner. The case status is marked as closed, indicating that all matters have been resolved.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, as evidenced by the original petition filed on January 22, 2015, and the subsequent waiver of service. The docket entries indicate a relatively simple process, culminating in a prove-up hearing and closure of the case on March 31, 2015. The financial information reflects a single transaction for court costs, further suggesting a lack of complexity in the legal issues presented.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily consist of procedural information related to a divorce petition and financial assessments for Anna L. Amrine.

Monetary value: The case appears to be a divorce proceeding involving Anna L. Amrine, with a total financial assessment of \$282.00 noted in the docket. This amount likely reflects court fees rather than the monetary stakes involved in the divorce itself, which could vary significantly based on the assets and liabilities at issue. No specific monetary value for the overall case is provided, but it is reasonable to estimate that the financial implications could be considerably higher than the assessed fees, possibly in the thousands depending on the couple's financial situation.

[CHRISTOPHER MUNOZ vs. ESTEPHANIE HERNANDEZ](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Christopher A. Munoz, in this family law case involving a divorce. The docket indicates that the case involved a waiver of service and various procedural entries leading up to a dismissal for want of prosecution.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the docket's case status. The most recent entry notes a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 3, 2015, which typically signifies the conclusion of the case proceedings. Additionally, all financial transactions related to the case have been settled.

Background: The cause of action in this case is for divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on February 12, 2015. The docket entries reflect procedural steps leading to a judgment, including a waiver of service and a report to Austin, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 3, 2015. The case was initiated by Christopher A. Munoz, who also completed the required financial assessment related to the divorce proceedings.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case was limited, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 3, 2015, following the filing of the original petition for divorce on February 12, 2015. Roderick Dale Marx, representing the petitioner Christopher A. Munoz, engaged with procedural requirements

such as waivers of service and a prove-up report, but the case ultimately did not progress to a substantive resolution, reflecting a lack of active prosecution by the petitioner.

Duration: The case was filed on February 12, 2015, and was closed with a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 3, 2015. Therefore, the case lasted a total of approximately six months and twenty-three days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case, initiated by Christopher A. Munoz with an original petition for divorce filed on February 12, 2015, ultimately resulted in a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 3, 2015. Following the filing, various procedural steps occurred, including a waiver of service and a report to Austin, but the case did not proceed to judgment, as indicated by the notice of judgment mailed on April 22, 2015. The case is now closed, presided over by Judicial Officer Mary Brown.

Complexity: The case is a divorce with children, which typically involves complex emotional and financial considerations; however, the docket reveals a relatively straightforward process. The key entries indicate that the case was initiated with an Original Petition for Divorce, followed by a waiver of service, and concluded with a dismissal for want of prosecution after minimal activity. The financial assessment suggests that the parties may have resolved their financial issues efficiently, contributing to the case's lack of complexity. Overall, the rapid progression and closure imply that the case did not involve extensive litigation or contentious disputes.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that there were no experts involved in the case, as there is no mention of expert witnesses or reports. Additionally, there is no evidence that Roderick Marx hired any experts, as the entries primarily focus on procedural matters related to the divorce case.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce petition filed by Christopher A. Munoz, with a total financial assessment of \$333.00 noted in the docket. This suggests that the monetary stakes of the case were relatively low, likely reflecting limited financial assets or claims in the divorce proceedings. There are no indications of significant financial disputes or higher monetary values involved in this case.

[KENDRA SPRESLEY vs. ALLEN WALKER, SR.](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Kendra L. Spresley, in the case. This is evident from the docket entries indicating his role as counsel for the petitioner, while the respondent, Allen C. Walker, Sr., was represented by Crystal Seiber.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have been completed and no further action is pending. The docket entries date back to February 12, 2015, with the last recorded activity on April 21, 2015, suggesting that the case progressed through various stages, including the filing of an original petition for divorce and a waiver of service. There are no entries indicating ongoing litigation or unresolved issues, confirming the closure status.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "ORIGINAL PETITION FOR DIVORCE" filed on February 12, 2015. The case was initiated in the family court, and the docket reflects that Kendra L. Spresley is the petitioner, having fulfilled the financial assessment requirements associated with the filing. The subsequent entries indicate procedural steps such as waiver of service and docket sheet reports, which are typical in divorce proceedings.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around the original petition for divorce filed by Kendra L. Spresley on February 12, 2015, with Roderick Dale Marx representing her as the petitioner. Subsequent docket entries indicate procedural steps such as a waiver of service and a report to Austin, but there is no indication of any contested motions or significant rulings that would highlight Roderick Marx's performance in motion practice. The entries suggest a straightforward process with no complex litigation or challenges presented by the respondent, Allen C. Walker, Sr., represented by Crystal Seiber.

Duration: The case was initiated on February 12, 2015, with the filing of the original petition for divorce, and it closed after the last docket entry on April 21, 2015. Thus, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately 2 months and 9 days.

Outcome: The case, initiated with an original petition for divorce filed on February 12, 2015, concluded with a report submitted to Austin on April 21, 2015. A waiver of service was acknowledged on April 16, 2015, and all financial assessments totaling \$282.00 were fully paid by the petitioner, Kendra L. Spresley. The case is now officially closed.

Complexity: The case involves a divorce without children, indicated by the original petition filed on February 12, 2015, and concluded with a "prove up" on April 21, 2015. The docket reflects a straightforward process, with a waiver of service and a financial assessment indicating that all fees were paid. Given the absence of complexities such as child custody disputes or asset division issues, the case appears to be relatively simple and was resolved efficiently.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural aspects of the divorce case between Kendra Spresley and Roderick Marx without reference to expert testimony or consultation.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce proceeding, as indicated by the original petition for divorce filed on February 12, 2015. The only financial information provided suggests an assessment of \$282.00 and corresponding payments, indicating that this case likely involves relatively modest financial stakes. No specific larger monetary amounts are mentioned in the docket.

[HILSA ESCOBAR vs. CARLOS ESCOBAR](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Hilsa Y. Escobar, in the case. The docket entries indicate that he was involved in the filing of the original petition and subsequent proceedings. The respondent in the case is Carlos Escobar.

Status: The case has been officially marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have concluded and no further actions are pending. Key entries in the docket, including the notice of judgment mailed and the financial transactions, suggest that all necessary steps have been taken to finalize the case.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be related to a family law matter, as indicated by the "NEW CASE FILED (OCA) - FAMILY" entry. The initiating document is the "ORIGINAL PETITION," filed on January 8, 2015, which suggests that Hilsa Y. Escobar is the petitioner in this family law case. The timeline includes procedural entries such as the issuance of citations and the return of service, indicating ongoing litigation activities.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around Hilsa Y. Escobar, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, as the petitioner against Carlos Escobar, the respondent. The docket entries indicate that the case initiated with the filing of an original petition on January 8, 2015, followed by the issuance of citations and the execution of service, leading up to a judgment notice sent on April 7, 2015. Roderick Marx's performance appears to be focused on ensuring proper service and compliance with procedural requirements, culminating in a prove-up to finalize the petitioner's claims. The filings reflect a structured approach to litigation, with timely submissions and financial assessments indicating an organized case management strategy by Marx.

Duration: The case lasted from January 8, 2015, when the original petition was filed, until April 7, 2015, when the notice of judgment was mailed, totaling approximately three months and 30 days. The case status is marked as closed.

Outcome: The case initiated by Hilsa Y. Escobar was filed as a family law matter on January 8, 2015, with subsequent steps including the issuance of citation and service executed by February 26, 2015. A judgment was reached, and a notice of judgment was mailed on April 7, 2015, indicating a resolution of the case, which is now marked as closed. Financial assessments show a total payment of \$290, reflecting the transaction history associated with this case.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal matter. The docket shows a series of standard procedural entries, including the filing of the original petition, issuance of citations, and a notice of judgment, all of which suggest minimal complexity. The financial information indicates that the case involved standard fees and payments, further simplifying the overall legal process. The case has been closed, reinforcing the notion that it was resolved without significant complication.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they suggest that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural aspects such as citations, service of process, and financial transactions related to the parties involved.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve small financial assessments totaling \$290.00, with payments made through credit card transactions reflecting this amount. Given the context and the nature of the entries, it suggests a minor monetary dispute, likely within a family law context. Thus, the case can be roughly estimated to be valued at around \$290.00.

[MICHAEL SANTOS vs. SHERIAN SANTOS](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx served as counsel for the petitioner, Michael A. Santos, in the case. This indicates that he represented the plaintiff's interests in the legal proceedings. The docket entries reflect actions taken in relation to the petition filed by Santos, further supporting his role as the plaintiff's attorney.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have concluded. Key entries, including the original petition filed on December 22, 2014, and the judgment notice mailed on March 10, 2015, suggest that the case progressed through the necessary hearings and concluded with a judgment.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be related to family law, as indicated by the filing of an "Original Petition" under a new case, suggesting issues such as divorce, custody, or support. The docket entries reflect procedural steps taken, including a waiver and a prove-up hearing, with the initial petition filed on December 22, 2014, by Michael A. Santos, which implies he is the petitioner in this family matter.

Motion practice: The motion practice in the case primarily revolves around the petition filed by Michael A. Santos, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, against Sherian E. Santos. Key docket entries include the original petition filed on December 22, 2014, and subsequent motions leading up to a prove-up hearing held on March 10, 2015. Roderick Marx's performance appears focused on efficiently navigating the early procedural stages, culminating in the hearing where the court would assess the merits of the case based on the established filings. The timeline indicates a prompt progression in the case, suggesting active engagement from counsel in moving the matter forward.

Duration: The case was filed on December 22, 2014, and closed following the last docket entry on March 10, 2015. This indicates that the case lasted for approximately 2 months and 18 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case involving Michael A. Santos was initiated with the filing of the original petition on December 22, 2014, and included a waiver filed on March 9, 2015. A prove-up hearing was held on March 10, 2015, resulting in a judgment, as indicated by the notice of judgment mailed on the same day. The case has since been marked as closed, with all financial assessments and payments totaling \$285.00 duly processed.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, indicating limited complexity. The docket entries include a waiver, an original petition, and a prove-up hearing, all of which suggest a relatively simple process without contested issues. The case was filed and closed within a few months, further reflecting its uncomplicated nature. Overall, the absence of children and minimal contested matters contributed to a streamlined resolution.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily detail procedural aspects and financial transactions related to the case.

Monetary value: The monetary aspect of the case appears to be minimal, as indicated by the financial information detailing a total financial assessment of \$285.00, which reflects a single transaction for the filing fee. There are no other monetary claims or damages mentioned in the docket entries, suggesting that the case may not involve significant financial stakes beyond this amount.

[TERESA GRAVES vs. DANIEL GRAVES](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx is listed as counsel for the petitioner, Teresa A. Graves, indicating that he represents the Plaintiff in this case. The respondent is Daniel Graves. The docket entries reflect the procedural steps taken in the family law matter initiated by the original petition filed on February 12, 2015.

Status: The case is marked as "CLOSED," indicating that it has finished and is no longer active. The last relevant entries date back to 2015, with financial transactions and filings occurring throughout that year. There are no recent entries suggesting ongoing activity or unresolved matters.

Background: The cause of action is likely related to a family law matter, as indicated by the filing of an "Original Petition" under the category of "Family" on February 12, 2015. The docket reflects the initiation of the case by Teresa A. Graves, who paid a total financial assessment of \$282.00, suggesting that the dispute may involve issues such as custody, divorce, or child support. Further details regarding the specific claims or factual background are not provided in the entries listed.

Motion practice: The docket indicates that Roderick Dale Marx represents the petitioner, Teresa A. Graves, in a family law case initiated on February 12, 2015, with the filing of the original petition and the subsequent waiver of service on June 25, 2015. The motion practice appears limited, as the docket entries primarily consist of procedural filings, including a report and a request to prove up dated June 30, 2015, suggesting that the case did not involve extensive motion litigation but rather straightforward procedural steps leading to potential resolution.

Duration: The case commenced on February 12, 2015, when the original petition was filed, and it concluded on June 30, 2015, with the final docket entries indicating the completion of necessary processes. This results in a total duration of approximately 4 months and 18 days from start to finish. The case is now marked as closed.

Outcome: The case involving Teresa A. Graves was initiated with the filing of an original petition on February 12, 2015, and included a waiver of service on June 25, 2015. Following procedural steps including a report to Austin and a prove-up on June 30, 2015, the case has been marked as closed. Financially, the total assessment of \$282.00 was paid in full, indicating compliance with court costs.

Complexity: The case involves a divorce without children, indicating a potentially straightforward legal matter. Key docket entries include the original petition filed on February 12, 2015, and a waiver of service, suggesting both parties may have cooperated in the proceedings. The case was closed shortly after with a "prove up" hearing, which often signifies an uncontested divorce process. Overall, the complexity appears low, given the nature of the filings and the absence of contentious issues.

Experts: The docket does not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily consist of procedural filings and financial transactions related to one party, Teresa A. Graves.

Monetary value: The case appears to be a family law matter initiated by Teresa A. Graves, with a total financial assessment of \$282.00. This amount reflects the fees associated with the filing and processing of the case, indicating that the monetary scope of the case is relatively low, likely focused on procedural aspects rather than significant financial claims or damages. No specific claims for damages or larger monetary amounts are indicated in the docket entries.

[MARIA TORCUATOR vs. TIMOTHY STONE, SR.](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Maria S. Torcuator, in the case against Timothy D. Stone, Sr., who was the respondent. The docket entries indicate that the case involved family law matters, with filings including an original petition and subsequent judicial actions.

Status: The case has been officially closed, as indicated by the case status. The last relevant docket entry is a notice of judgment mailed on January 6, 2015, suggesting that all proceedings have been completed and final decisions rendered.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be related to family law, as indicated by the filing of an "Original Petition" on October 21, 2014. The docket reflects various procedural entries, including a "Prove Up" and a "Waiver," suggesting that the matter may involve an uncontested issue or agreement between the parties. The case was initiated by Maria S. Torcuator, who has completed financial assessments totaling \$285.00, indicating potential issues regarding costs or fees associated with the proceedings.

Motion practice: The docket entries reflect a series of procedural actions in a family law case initiated by Maria S. Torcuator on October 21, 2014, culminating in a judgment notice on January 6, 2015. Notably, there is no specific mention of Roderick Marx or any motions associated with his performance, indicating that his

involvement may not have included significant motion practice or that it was not documented in the available entries. The entries primarily detail the filing of the original petition, financial assessments, and procedural notifications rather than any contested motions or hearings.

Duration: The case was filed on October 21, 2014, and closed following the notice of judgment mailed on January 6, 2015. This indicates that the case lasted a total of approximately 2 months and 16 days from initiation to resolution.

Outcome: The case, initiated by Maria S. Torcuator with the filing of an Original Petition on October 21, 2014, culminated in a judgment, as indicated by the Notice of Judgment mailed on January 6, 2015. The financial assessment was fully paid, totaling \$285.00, and the case was marked as closed following the completion of necessary procedures, including a waiver and report to Austin. The docket reflects a streamlined process with no contested issues noted, suggesting an uncontested matter that reached resolution efficiently.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, indicated by the simplicity of the docket entries. Key filings include an Original Petition and a Waiver, followed by a Prove Up, suggesting uncontested proceedings. The case was resolved efficiently, with a judgment mailed shortly after the necessary filings, reflecting minimal complexity. The financial assessment indicates a total fee of \$285, further underscoring the case's uncomplicated nature.

Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily consist of procedural updates, financial assessments, and filings related to the case.

Monetary value: The case appears to be a family law matter involving a financial assessment of \$285, which indicates the monetary aspect of the case is relatively small. There are no indications of larger claims or damages stated in the docket entries, and the only financial transaction noted is the total assessment and payment of \$285. Therefore, it can be estimated that the case is minor in terms of monetary value.

[MELODY BULLER vs. DOUGLAS BULLER](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx served as the counsel for the petitioner, Melody L. Buller, in the case. This indicates that he represented the plaintiff in the original petition for divorce filed on January 6, 2015. The docket entries reflect actions taken in the context of this family law matter, reinforcing his role as the legal representative advocating for the interests of the petitioner.

Status: The case is marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have been finalized and no further actions are pending. The last docket entry was on March 11, 2015, with various proceedings related to a divorce case, including hearings and financial assessments. Given this status, it can be concluded that the matter has been resolved.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on January 6, 2015. The docket entries suggest that the matter involves issues related to the withholding of earnings from employment, as reflected in the multiple orders for employers to withhold, indicating a potential dispute over financial obligations resulting from the divorce proceedings.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily involved the petitioner, Melody L. Buller, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, who filed an original petition for divorce on January 6, 2015. Subsequent motions included orders for employers to withhold on two occasions, with hearings held to prove up the case, culminating in a financial assessment. The case ultimately closed following the completion of these motions and hearings. Roderick Marx's performance can be noted for effectively navigating the procedural requirements and advancing his client's interests throughout the divorce proceedings.

Duration: The case lasted from January 6, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, until it was closed following the final docket entry on March 11, 2015. This indicates a total duration of approximately two months and five days. The case involved various procedural steps, including hearings and orders related to employer withholdings, demonstrating active engagement in the divorce proceedings.

Outcome: The case, initiated on January 6, 2015, with an Original Petition for Divorce by Melody L. Buller, progressed through several procedural steps, including orders for employers to withhold and a prove-up hearing held on March 10, 2015. A waiver of service was filed on March 4, 2015, and the financial assessment indicated a total payment of \$333.00. The case has been officially closed, indicating that all matters have been resolved.

Complexity: The case is a divorce involving children, indicating potential complexities related to custody and support arrangements. However, the docket reflects a straightforward process with a waiver of service, an original petition, and orders for employers to withhold income, suggesting minimal contention. The case was closed following a prove-up hearing, which typically signifies that all necessary agreements were reached. Overall, the case appears to be of low complexity.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they suggest that Roderick Marx hired any experts. The entries primarily consist of procedural updates related to a divorce case, without mention of expert testimony or assessments.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce proceeding, as indicated by the original petition filed on January 6, 2015. The docket includes a financial assessment for Melody L. Buller totaling \$333.00, which likely reflects court fees or costs associated with the case. There is no indication of additional monetary claims or disputes mentioned in the entries, suggesting that the overall financial stakes in this case are relatively modest, estimated at around \$333.00.

[SELDA LEYVA vs. WILLIAM LEYVA](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx served as counsel for the petitioner, Selda Leyva, in the case. This indicates that he represented the interests of the plaintiff rather than the defendant, William J. Leyva. The docket entries reflect various procedural steps, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution.

Status: The case has been officially closed, as indicated by the case status labeled "CLOSED." The last significant entry in the docket was a "DISMISSAL FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION" dated September 2, 2015, which suggests that the case was not actively pursued, leading to its closure. Additionally, all financial assessments and transactions have been settled, reinforcing the conclusion that the case is concluded.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be related to a family law matter, as indicated by the "ORIGINAL PETITION" filed on February 20, 2015. The docket reflects a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 2, 2015, suggesting that the case was not actively pursued by the plaintiff, Selda Leyva, after the initial filing. Additionally, there is a financial assessment indicating a total payment of \$333.00, which likely pertains to court fees associated with the filing.

Motion practice: In the case involving Selda Leyva as the petitioner and William J. Leyva as the respondent, Roderick Dale Marx represented Selda Leyva. The motion practice included various entries leading to a dismissal for want of prosecution, with significant actions taken on 07/23/2015 (waiver), 07/28/2015 (judgment notice and report), and culminating in the dismissal on 09/02/2015, indicating that the case had not progressed adequately under Marx's representation. The case is now closed, reflecting a lack of substantive motion performance from Marx that could have potentially advanced the case beyond mere procedural steps.

Duration: The case was initiated on February 20, 2015, and closed with a dismissal for want of prosecution on September 2, 2015. This indicates that the case lasted for a total of approximately 6 months and 13 days.

Outcome: The case involving Selda Leyva was initiated with the filing of an Original Petition on February 20, 2015, and subsequently assessed financial fees totaling \$333.00, which were fully paid. However, the case was dismissed for want of prosecution on September 2, 2015, following a series of procedural events, including a report to Austin and notice of judgment mailed on July 28, 2015, indicating a lack of further action or progression in the case. Ultimately, the case status is marked as closed.

Complexity: The case is a divorce with children, which inherently involves considerations of custody, support, and division of assets, suggesting a moderate level of complexity. However, the docket entries indicate a dismissal for want of prosecution, suggesting that the case may not have progressed significantly, and key procedural steps such as waiver and prove-up occurred in a short timeline. Ultimately, the case has been closed, which may indicate a resolution was reached, albeit not through a contested process.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they mention whether any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. All entries pertain to procedural matters, including dismissals, judgments, and financial assessments, without reference to expert testimony or analysis.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a financial assessment totaling \$333.00, which corresponds to the payments made by the party Leyva, Selda. This suggests that the monetary stakes in this case were relatively low, likely limited to the assessed fees rather than any substantial damages or claims. Given the context of a family case, this amount may relate to court fees or minor claims rather than a larger financial dispute.

[HAMIDA HEMANI vs. NADEEM VEERANI](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Hamida N. Hemani, in the case concerning the original petition for divorce. The respondent in the case is Nadeem Veerani. The docket entries indicate that the case was filed on March 25, 2015, and included a waiver of service.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the docket's status. The final entries include various filings related to a divorce petition and a waiver of service, culminating in a financial assessment that shows all payments have been made. The docket reflects a complete procedural history leading to the closure of the matter.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on March 25, 2015. The initiating document outlines the legal proceedings initiated by Hamida N. Hemani seeking to dissolve her marriage, with the case categorized under family law. The docket also reflects a waiver of service, suggesting that the respondent may have agreed to the proceedings without formal service of process.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around the original petition for divorce filed by Hamida N. Hemani, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, and the subsequent procedural steps taken, including the waiver of service and a prove up. Roderick Marx's performance as counsel is highlighted by his active representation in the initiation of the case, ensuring that necessary filings and financial assessments were completed in a timely manner. The docket entries indicate a straightforward process without any contested motions, suggesting a cooperative approach between the parties involved.

Duration: The case began on March 25, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, and it was officially closed after the last docket entries on June 23, 2015. Thus, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately three months.

Outcome: The case, initiated on March 25, 2015, involved an original petition for divorce filed by Hamida N. Hemani, with the case being categorized under family law. A waiver of service was executed on May 21, 2015, followed by a prove-up hearing on June 23, 2015, leading to the case being officially closed on the same date. The financial assessment indicated a total of \$282.00 paid for court fees, reflecting the completion of all necessary financial obligations related to the case.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, indicating a relatively simple legal matter. Key docket entries include the filing of an original petition for divorce, a waiver of service, and a prove-up, all of which suggest that the parties likely reached an agreement without significant disputes. The case was closed shortly after being filed, reinforcing the notion of minimal complexity involved.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that this is a divorce case involving Hamida N. Hemani, with no mention of any experts being involved or hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily consist of procedural filings, including a petition for divorce and a waiver of service, without any reference to expert testimony or evaluations.

Monetary value: The case appears to be a divorce proceeding, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on March 25, 2015. There is no specific monetary amount listed in the docket entries regarding the financial aspects of the divorce; however, a total financial assessment of \$282.00 is noted, which may reflect court fees rather than the value of the case itself. Given the nature of divorce cases, any potential monetary implications could vary widely, but without additional financial details, a rough estimate of the case's value cannot be determined.

[ROY SIMON vs. DEMPY JAMES](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx served as counsel for the petitioner, Roy M. Simon, in this case. The docket entries indicate that the case involves a divorce, with Simon as the party initiating the proceedings. Dempsey James is identified as the respondent, further clarifying the roles of the parties involved.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have concluded. The last relevant docket entries date back to March 2015, with the final judgment and related notices issued around that time. All necessary filings and actions appear to have been completed, confirming the case's closure.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a petition for divorce, as indicated by the filing of the original petition on December 22, 2014. The factual background suggests that the parties had reached a separation agreement, as evidenced by the correspondence dated February 9, 2015, and a waiver of service was executed on March 2, 2015. The docket entries reflect procedural steps taken towards finalizing the divorce, including service of citation and subsequent actions leading to judgment.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around the divorce proceedings initiated by Roy M. Simon, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, against the respondent, Demp James. Key entries include the filing of the original petition for divorce on December 22, 2014, and subsequent motions related to service and waiver, culminating in a judgment notice mailed on March 3, 2015. Roderick Marx's performance appears focused on ensuring proper service and documentation, as evidenced by the correspondence regarding the separation agreement and the successful prove-up process.

Duration: The case lasted from December 22, 2014, when the original petition for divorce was filed, until it was closed on March 3, 2015, following the notice of judgment. This results in a total duration of approximately 2 months and 9 days.

Outcome: The case, initiated on December 22, 2014, involved an original petition for divorce and was ultimately resolved with a judgment mailed on March 3, 2015, following a prove-up hearing. A separation agreement was filed on February 9, 2015, and service was waived by the parties involved. The case is now closed, indicating that all matters related to the divorce have been finalized and documented.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, indicated by the case type and the absence of complex issues such as custody or financial disputes. The docket entries show a swift progression through the legal process, with key filings including a separation agreement and a waiver of service, suggesting both parties likely reached an amicable resolution. The case was filed and closed within a few months, further indicating its relatively uncomplicated nature.

Experts: There is no indication that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx in the provided docket entries. The entries primarily focus on procedural matters related to the divorce petition and service of process.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that this case involves a divorce, as evidenced by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on December 22, 2014, and the subsequent separation agreement referenced in correspondence. There is no specific monetary amount mentioned in the entries; however, divorce cases can vary widely in financial implications, often involving asset division, alimony, or child support, suggesting a rough estimate could range from a few thousand to several hundred thousand dollars, depending on the couple's financial circumstances.

[LAURA BROWN vs. BRODI BROWN](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Laura N. Brown, in the case. The docket entries indicate that he was involved as counsel for the party initiating the legal action, which is a divorce proceeding against the respondent, Brodi T. Brown.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have concluded. The last docket entry is from December 3, 2014, which suggests that the case has reached its final resolution. Notably, the financial information shows that the total assessment and payments were completed, further indicating that there are no outstanding issues.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on September 15, 2014, by Laura N. Brown. The case is categorized under family law, and the docket reflects that financial assessments and payments were made in relation to this filing.

Motion practice: The legal docket indicates that Roderick Dale Marx represented Laura N. Brown as the petitioner in a divorce case, which was initiated on September 15, 2014. The case involved a financial assessment and the payment of court fees totaling \$285.00, with no motions or objections noted from the respondent, Brodi T. Brown. The case was subsequently closed, suggesting that any motion practice was likely resolved without contentious litigation.

Duration: The case began on September 15, 2014, when the original petition for divorce was filed, and it was officially closed sometime after December 3, 2014, as indicated by the last entry in the docket. The duration of the case from start to finish is approximately 2 months and 18 days.

Outcome: The case, initiated on September 15, 2014, involved a divorce petition filed by Laura N. Brown, with a total financial assessment of \$285.00, which was fully paid. A waiver was submitted by Brodi T. Brown on November 20, 2014, and the case was subsequently reported to Austin on December 3, 2014. The case is now officially closed.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal issue. The docket entries reflect standard procedural steps, including a petition for divorce, a waiver, and financial assessments. There are no indications of disputes or complications, suggesting that the case was likely resolved without significant legal complexity. The case status is marked as closed, further implying a completed and uncomplicated process.

Experts: The docket does not indicate any involvement of experts in the case, nor does it specify that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily detail procedural aspects of the divorce filing and financial assessments related to Laura N. Brown.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce proceeding, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on 09/15/2014. The total financial assessment listed for the party, Laura N. Brown, is \$285.00, which likely represents court-related fees rather than the monetary value of the assets or liabilities in the divorce itself. Therefore, while the specific financial stakes in the divorce are not detailed, the known monetary aspect of the case is limited to this amount.

ZORIED RIVERA vs. DANIEL SANCHEZ

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the petitioner, Zoried Rivera, in this case. The docket entries indicate that the original petition for divorce was filed on January 13, 2015, with Marx listed as counsel for Rivera. The case ultimately faced dismissal for want of prosecution on August 6, 2015.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the case status being marked as "CLOSED." The final docket entry is a dismissal for want of prosecution dated 08/06/2015, which suggests that the case did not proceed further. All prior entries relate to the initial filings and procedural orders leading up to this dismissal.

Background: The cause of action in this case is divorce, as indicated by the "ORIGINAL PETITION FOR DIVORCE" filed on January 13, 2015. The docket entries suggest that the case involved procedural matters such as waivers of service and financial assessments, culminating in a dismissal for want of prosecution on August 6, 2015.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolves around the petitioner, Zoried Rivera, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, who filed an original petition for divorce on January 13, 2015. Following various procedural entries, including a waiver of service and subsequent orders, the case faced a dismissal for want of prosecution on August 6, 2015, indicating that the court found insufficient progress or activity in moving the case forward. Roderick Marx's performance appears to have involved initial filings and procedural compliance, but ultimately, the case did not proceed to resolution, resulting in dismissal.

Duration: The case lasted from January 13, 2015, when the original petition for divorce was filed, until it was closed with a dismissal for want of prosecution on August 6, 2015. This results in a total duration of approximately 7 months and 24 days.

Outcome: The case, initiated on January 13, 2015, with an original petition for divorce filed by Zoried Rivera, was ultimately dismissed for want of prosecution on August 6, 2015. Prior to the dismissal, several procedural steps were taken, including orders for employers to withhold, and reports submitted to both Austin and DRO, indicating that the case involved financial assessments and compliance measures. The case is now closed, reflecting a lack of further action or interest from the plaintiff post-filing.

Complexity: The case is a divorce involving children, which typically presents complexities related to custody and support arrangements. However, the docket entries indicate a lack of prosecution, culminating in a dismissal, suggesting that the case may not have proceeded through significant litigation. The presence of only basic procedural entries, including a waiver of service and an original petition, further points to a relatively straightforward case that was ultimately not pursued. Overall, the complexity appears low, given the quick dismissal and limited litigation activity.

Experts: There are no indications in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily document procedural matters related to a divorce case and financial assessments without reference to expert testimony or consultations.

Monetary value: The case titled "ZORIED RIVERA vs. DANIEL SANCHEZ" appears to involve a divorce proceeding, as indicated by the original petition filed. The monetary aspect mentioned in the docket reflects a total financial assessment of \$333.00, which likely pertains to court fees or costs associated with the case. Given the nature of family law cases, the overall financial stakes could vary significantly, but the specific amount mentioned suggests a relatively small case from a monetary perspective.

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx represented the Petitioner, Rolando O. Mendoza, in the case involving a divorce petition against Respondent Maria T. Mendoza. The case culminated in a final order of dismissal, indicating that the court closed the matter without further proceedings.

Status: The case has been concluded and closed as indicated by the Final Order/Judgment/Decree issued on August 31, 2015, which dismisses the case entirely for the parties involved. The case status is marked as "Inactive: Disposed," confirming that no further actions are pending.

Background: The cause of action in this case was a divorce, as indicated by the Original Petition for Divorce filed on December 30, 2014. The case was later dismissed by a final order on August 31, 2015, following a dismissal hearing held on August 21, 2015, presided over by Judicial Officer Margaret E. Barnes.

Motion practice: Roderick Marx received a Notice of Judgment on September 2, 2015, indicating that he was a party involved in the proceedings that reached a final resolution. The case, which began with an Original Petition for Divorce on December 30, 2014, culminated in a Dismissal Hearing held on August 21, 2015, presided over by Judge Margaret E. Barnes, leading to a Final Order/Judgment on August 31, 2015, that closed the case entirely. No specific motions filed by Roderick Marx are detailed in the docket, suggesting limited active participation in motion practice during the proceedings.

Duration: The case lasted from December 30, 2014, when the Original Petition for Divorce was filed, until August 31, 2015, when the Final Order/Judgment was issued, resulting in a total duration of approximately 8 months and 1 day.

Outcome: The case, initiated by the Original Petition for Divorce filed on December 30, 2014, concluded with a Final Order on August 31, 2015, where the court, presided over by Judge Margaret E. Barnes, issued an Order of Dismissal for both Maria T. Mendoza and Rolando O. Mendoza. A dismissal hearing was held on August 21, 2015, leading to the case's inactive status as disposed, with a Notice of Judgment sent to Roderick Dale Marx on September 2, 2015.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, which typically indicates a less complex legal matter. The docket reflects a streamlined process with a dismissal hearing and a final judgment issued within a year of the original petition filed on December 30, 2014. The absence of any contentious hearings or extended disputes suggests that the case was resolved efficiently, resulting in a timely dismissal by the court. Overall, the simplicity of the proceedings points to a straightforward dissolution of marriage.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that the case concluded with a dismissal order, but there is no mention of any expert witnesses or experts being involved in the case. Additionally, nothing in the entries suggests that Roderick Marx hired any experts.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that this case involved a divorce proceeding, culminating in a final order of dismissal. However, there is no specific monetary amount mentioned in the entries, and given the nature of divorce cases, any financial implications would likely involve disputes over assets or alimony, which can vary widely. As such, without specific figures, it is difficult to ascertain the monetary size of the case, but a rough estimate for similar divorce cases might range from tens of thousands to a few hundred thousand dollars, depending on the assets involved.

[ALMA HERNANDEZ vs. ROSALIO HERNANDEZ](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx served as the attorney for the petitioner, Alma I. Hernandez, in the case. This indicates that he represented the interests of the petitioner against the respondent, Rosalio Hernandez. The docket entries reflect various procedural steps taken in the case, underscoring the active role of the petitioner's counsel.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have concluded. The last relevant entries date back to 2015, with no further activity or docket entries since then, reinforcing the case's closure status.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be related to a family law matter, as indicated by the original petition filed on November 14, 2014. The docket entries suggest procedural steps taken for service of process by publication, including the issuance of citations and the appointment of an attorney ad litem for a respondent who could not be located. The context implies a potential dispute involving family law issues, possibly concerning custody or support, though specific factual details are not explicitly outlined in the docket entries.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case involved several key filings and hearings, with Roderick Dale Marx serving as the attorney for the petitioner, Alma I. Hernandez. The docket entries indicate a series of procedural steps including the appointment of an attorney ad litem, citations issued by publication, and a prove-up hearing held on March 10, 2015, suggesting active engagement in ensuring due process for the respondent, Rosalio Hernandez. Marx's performance appears diligent, as he filed an original petition and participated in hearings to advance the case, demonstrating a commitment to representing his client's interests effectively.

Duration: The case lasted from November 14, 2014, when it was filed, until it was closed on April 30, 2015. This amounts to a duration of approximately 5 months and 16 days. The docket entries reflect various procedural activities during this period, culminating in the case's closure.

Outcome: The case has been closed, with the original petition filed on November 14, 2014, and subsequent citations issued, including a citation by publication due to the respondent's inability to be served directly. An attorney ad litem was appointed on December 9, 2014, to represent the interests of the respondent, and a hearing was held on March 10, 2015, to prove the case. The financial assessments indicate that the petitioner, Alma I. Hernandez, incurred fees totaling

\$416.00, which were fully paid. The final outcome of the case is not specified in the docket entries, but the closure suggests a resolution was reached.

Complexity: The case appears to be moderately complex, involving a divorce with children and requiring the appointment of an attorney ad litem, indicating potential issues with service of process or the respondent's participation. The use of citation by publication suggests difficulties in locating the respondent, which can complicate proceedings. Additionally, the presence of a statement of evidence and hearings further indicates that the case may involve contested issues or the need for judicial determinations regarding custody or financial matters.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they specify that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily consist of procedural documents and filings related to the case without mention of expert testimony or consultation.

Monetary value: The case appears to be relatively small in terms of monetary value, with total financial assessments amounting to \$416.00, which includes payments and credits. There are no indications of larger monetary claims or damages mentioned in the docket entries. The primary focus seems to be procedural, rather than financially substantial.

[HENRY QUEZADA vs. CRYSTAL QUEZADA](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Marx represented Henry Quezada, the petitioner in the case, indicating that he was advocating for the interests of the plaintiff. The docket entries suggest that the case involved family law, with various procedural steps taken, including the filing of an original petition and the issuance of citations.

Status: The case has been officially marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all proceedings have been concluded. The last docket entries date back to 2015, suggesting that no further action has taken place since then. Therefore, it is clear that the case has finished and is no longer active.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to stem from a family law matter, as indicated by the "ORIGINAL PETITION" filed on November 6, 2014. The docket entries include multiple citations and a return of service executed, suggesting that the case involves a formal dispute where service of process was necessary, indicating the parties were likely in disagreement over familial issues that required judicial intervention.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case appears to be minimal, with key entries including a "Prove Up" on March 31, 2015, and a "Waiver" on March 26, 2015, indicating a possible resolution without extensive litigation. Roderick Marx's specific motion performance is not detailed in the docket entries, which mainly document procedural aspects such as service of citation and judgment notifications rather than substantive motions or arguments made by him. The timeline suggests a straightforward family law case with limited motion activity.

Duration: The case began on November 6, 2014, with the filing of the original petition and concluded with its closure on March 31, 2015, following the notice of judgment. Therefore, the case lasted approximately 4 months and 25 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case, initiated with the filing of an original petition on November 6, 2014, progressed through several key stages, including the issuance and return of service of citation, a waiver filed on March 26, 2015, and a judgment notice mailed on March 31, 2015. Following a prove-up hearing, the case was officially closed, as indicated by the final entries in the docket. Additionally, there was a returned mail entry on April 15, 2015, suggesting potential communication issues post-judgment. Overall, the case appears to have reached a resolution with all procedural steps completed.

Complexity: The case is a divorce without children, indicating a relatively straightforward legal matter. The docket entries reflect typical procedural steps, including citation issuance, service, and a waiver, culminating in a judgment notice. The absence of contested issues or additional complexities suggests that the case was likely resolved efficiently and without significant legal disputes. Overall, the case appears to be of low complexity.

Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor does it mention that any experts were hired by Roderick Marx. All entries primarily relate to procedural aspects of the case and do not reference expert testimony or reports.

Monetary value: The docket entries do not provide a specific monetary amount related to the case, nor do they indicate any financial claims or damages sought by the parties involved. Given that it is a family law case, it likely involves issues such as custody or support, which could range significantly in terms of financial implications, but without explicit figures, a rough estimate cannot be determined.

[ANJA ROSS vs. DANNY ROSS](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Roderick Dale Marx served as legal counsel for the petitioner, Anja R. Ross, in the case. The docket entries indicate that he was involved in the original petition for divorce filed on November 13, 2014, and he remained associated with the case throughout subsequent proceedings. The respondent in this case is Danny M. Ross.

Status: The case has been marked as "CLOSED," indicating that all legal proceedings have concluded. Key entries include a dismissal for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015, and various filings related to a divorce petition initiated in November 2014. There were also issues with undeliverable certified copies returned to court, but the overall status confirms that the case is no longer active.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as indicated by the filing of the "Original Petition for Divorce" on November 13, 2014. The docket reflects procedural developments, including a waiver of service and a dismissal for want of prosecution, suggesting potential issues with prosecution or engagement in the case. The parties involved include Anja Ross, who has been assessed financial obligations related to the case.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily involved the petitioner, Anja R. Ross, represented by Roderick Dale Marx, who filed an original petition for divorce on November 13, 2014. Subsequent entries indicate a waiver of service and a "prove up" motion leading to the judgment notice mailed on January 27, 2015. However, the case faced dismissal for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015, indicating a critical lapse in procedural advancement, which may reflect on the performance and diligence of counsel in managing the case effectively. The case was ultimately closed, following these developments, with no further motions noted from Roderick Marx post-dismissal.

Duration: The case was initiated on November 13, 2014, with the filing of the original petition for divorce and was officially closed following a dismissal for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately 11 months.

Outcome: The case concerning Anja Ross initiated with the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on November 13, 2014, followed by a waiver of service. Although a judgment was mailed on January 27, 2015, the case was ultimately dismissed for want of prosecution on November 10, 2015. Additionally, certified copies related to the case were returned as undeliverable on January 27, 2020, and the case is now marked as closed with all financial assessments settled.

Complexity: The case appears to be relatively straightforward, involving a divorce without children, as indicated by the case type. It includes a petition for divorce, a waiver of service, and a single "prove up" hearing, suggesting that the parties may have reached an agreement without substantial contention. The docket also reflects procedural issues, such as a dismissal for want of prosecution and undeliverable documents, but these do not indicate significant complexity in the underlying legal issues. Overall, the case is marked as closed, further suggesting a resolution without protracted litigation.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Roderick Marx. The entries primarily focus on procedural matters, including a petition for divorce and subsequent administrative actions.

Monetary value: The case appears to involve a divorce filing by Anja R. Ross, with a total financial assessment of \$285.00, which indicates the monetary scope of the case may be relatively low. There are no specific claims for larger sums or damages indicated in the docket entries, suggesting that the financial aspects are limited to court fees rather than substantial monetary disputes.

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