

Question

Morgan Michelle Myers

Answer

Critical Assessment of Morgan Michelle Myers as a Litigant

This assessment of Morgan Michelle Myers as a litigant is based on four cases found matching the search criteria. Due to the limited number of cases, these findings may not fully represent her complete litigation history.

Typical Role & Case Types: In the cases found, Ms. Myers consistently appears as a "Real Party in Interest" or Plaintiff in mandamus actions within Texas courts, specifically the 2nd Court of Appeals and the Northern District Court. These cases ([02-25-00171-CV In re Charles Dustin Myers](#), [02-25-00164-CV In re Charles Dustin Myers, Relator](#), and [02-25-00166-CV In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)) suggest a pattern of seeking court orders to compel action from governmental entities or officials. One case (4:24-cv-01185 Myers v. Myers) appears to be a family law matter involving Charles Dustin Myers, removed to federal court and subsequently remanded for lack of jurisdiction.

Motion Practice: The motion practice in these cases is primarily focused on the initial filing of petitions for writs of mandamus, often accompanied by supporting affidavits and records. In 4:24-cv-01185 Myers v. Myers, her counsel successfully responded to a removal action, resulting in the case being remanded back to state court. This suggests an effective, albeit limited, approach to motion practice focused on clearly defined objectives.

Average Case Duration & Outcomes: The mandamus cases are too recent to determine a typical duration or outcome. 4:24-cv-01185 Myers v. Myers concluded quickly (2 days) due to jurisdictional issues. Based on the limited data, it is impossible to assess Ms. Myers' success rate or typical case resolution methods.

Notable Cases & Attorneys: The most noteworthy cases are the related mandamus actions ([02-25-00171-CV](#), [02-25-00164-CV](#), and [02-25-00166-CV](#)). Ms. Myers appears consistently represented by Cooper Carter (and the firm Marx Altman & Johnson in 4:24-cv-01185 Myers v. Myers), suggesting a strong attorney-client relationship. The nature of the relationship between Ms. Myers and Charles Dustin Myers, who is involved in all four cases, warrants further investigation.

Expert Witnesses & Monetary Value: There is no evidence of expert witness involvement in any of the cases found. The mandamus cases likely involve non-monetary relief. While the docket for 4:24-cv-01185 Myers v. Myers doesn't specify damages, the removal filing fee suggests a potentially higher value claim.

Insights for Legal Professionals: When facing Ms. Myers in litigation, anticipate clearly defined legal actions, particularly in mandamus proceedings. Her consistent representation by Cooper Carter suggests a deliberate and strategic approach to legal matters. Further research into the relationship between Ms. Myers and Charles Dustin Myers is recommended, as their frequent joint involvement in litigation may provide valuable context. Given the limited number of cases analyzed, gathering more information on her litigation history is crucial for a comprehensive understanding of her litigation approach.

While I did not locate many matching records from Docket Alarm, I may be able to help you locate more information. To improve your results, consider starting with a broader search and date range, then refine as needed. Include synonyms, variations, and both industry-specific and common terms. You may also need to account for jurisdictional differences in terminology. If you are still not locating results, please visit the Docket Alarm coverage page to verify we monitor your court of interest. We continuously expand our coverage to serve you better.

Legal Authorities

[Myers v. Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Morgan Michelle Myers is listed as a Plaintiff in the case, represented by counsel Cooper L. Carter from the firm Marx Altman & Johnson. The Defendant in this case is Charles Dustin Myers, who has filed a Notice of Removal.

Status: The case has been terminated and is marked as closed as of December 6, 2024, following an order to remand it back to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, due to lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The docket entries indicate that all necessary notifications and actions have been completed, confirming the closure of the case.

Background: The cause of action in this case involves a Notice of Removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1441, indicating that the defendant, Charles Dustin Myers, sought to transfer the case from the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, to federal court. The case was subsequently remanded due to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction, as determined by Judge Reed C. O'Connor. The docket reveals procedural steps taken, including the payment of a filing fee and the filing of various attachments related to the removal.

Motion practice: Morgan Michelle Myers, represented by Cooper L. Carter of Marx Altman & Johnson, is a plaintiff in a case that was remanded by Judge Reed C. O'Connor due to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction, indicating the court found it did not have the authority to hear the case. The motion practice included a notice of removal filed by defendant Charles Dustin Myers, along with multiple attachments and a filing fee, highlighting procedural activity prior to the remand order issued on December 6, 2024. The case was subsequently directed back to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, with a certified copy of the docket sheet sent to that court.

Duration: The case lasted from December 4, 2024, when it was filed, to December 6, 2024, when it was terminated, totaling a duration of 2 days. The case was remanded to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, due to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction as ordered by Judge Reed C. O'Connor.

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

Complexity: The case appears to be relatively straightforward, as it primarily involves a notice of removal filed by Charles Dustin Myers, which was subsequently remanded back to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The docket entries indicate minimal complexity, with a focus on procedural matters and the handling of jurisdictional issues rather than substantive legal disputes. The case is now closed, suggesting that it did not progress to significant litigation or discovery phases.

Experts: There is no indication of any experts being involved in the case, as the docket entries do not mention expert witnesses or expert testimony. The case involves a remand order due to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction, which suggests that the court did not find sufficient grounds to hear the case, but does not provide information regarding any expert involvement.

Monetary value: The docket entries do not specify a monetary amount related to the case. However, the Notice of Removal indicates that a filing fee of \$405.00 was paid, which suggests that the case may involve a claim of a similar or greater magnitude. Without further information, a rough estimate for the case could be in the range of thousands to tens of thousands of dollars, depending on the nature of the claims involved.

[In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Morgan Michelle Myers is identified as a "Real party in interest" in the case, which indicates that she is not the plaintiff or defendant but has a significant interest in the outcome of the proceedings. The relator in this case is Charles Dustin Myers, who is the one initiating the action, suggesting that Morgan Michelle Myers is likely supportive of or aligned with his position.

Status: The case is still ongoing as evidenced by the recent entries on April 14, 2025, indicating that a petition for writ of mandamus has been filed and submitted. There are no entries suggesting a resolution or closure, which indicates that the case has not yet finished.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating that the petitioner is seeking a court order to compel a governmental authority or official to perform a duty that is required by law. The factual background is not detailed in the docket entries, but the filing suggests that the petitioner believes that a legal obligation has not been fulfilled, necessitating judicial intervention.

Motion practice: The docket reflects that on April 14, 2025, a petition for writ of mandamus was filed and subsequently submitted. As Morgan Michelle Myers is designated as a "Real party in interest," her involvement, represented by counsel Cooper Carter, indicates that she has a substantial stake in the litigation's outcome, which could directly affect her rights or interests. The motion practice thus centers on the implications of this petition, particularly regarding how the court's decision could influence Myers' position.

Duration: The case lasted from April 14, 2025, when the petition for writ of mandamus was filed and submitted, with no subsequent entries indicating a conclusion. Therefore, the duration of the case remains undetermined as of the last docket entry.

Outcome: The case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus filed on April 14, 2025, which has also been submitted on the same day. The docket does not provide further details on the court's decision or any subsequent proceedings, indicating that the outcome remains unresolved at this stage.

Complexity: The case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating a request for a court order to compel a government official or entity to perform a duty they are legally obligated to complete. Given that only a single petition has been filed without additional entries or complexities, the case appears to be relatively straightforward, potentially focusing on a specific legal duty rather than a broader range of issues or disputes. The lack of subsequent activity suggests minimal complexity at this stage.

Experts: The docket entries indicate that Morgan Michelle Myers is a "Real party in interest" represented by counsel Cooper Carter, suggesting her significant stake in the litigation. However, there is no mention of any experts being involved in the case, nor is there any indication that they were hired by any party. The case primarily involves the Office of the Attorney General and the relator, Charles Dustin Myers, with the respondent being Hon. Jeffery N. Kaitcer.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate a petition for writ of mandamus was filed on April 14, 2025, but there are no monetary claims or specific amounts mentioned. Given the nature of a writ of mandamus, which typically seeks to compel a government or official action rather than seeking monetary damages, it is likely that the case does not involve a significant monetary value. Therefore, a rough estimate of the monetary implications, if any, would be minimal or negligible.

[In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Morgan Michelle Myers is identified as the "Real party in interest" in the case, indicating her role as the Plaintiff. The docket entries include the filing of an affidavit and a petition for writ of mandamus, further suggesting her active participation in pursuing the legal matter at hand.

Status: The case is still active as of April 16, 2025, with multiple entries indicating recent filings, including an affidavit, record, and a petition for a writ of mandamus. The submitted status suggests that the case is under review or awaiting further action by the court. Therefore, it has not yet been closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a petition for a writ of mandamus, which indicates a request for the court to compel a governmental entity or official to perform a duty that is mandated by law. The factual background, while not detailed in the docket entries, suggests that the petitioner believes there has been a failure to fulfill a legal obligation, prompting the need for judicial intervention as evidenced by the filing of both an affidavit and a record on the same date.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case includes the filing of a petition for writ of mandamus on April 16, 2025, along with supporting documents such as an affidavit and record, all submitted on the same day. Morgan Michelle Myers is designated as the "real party in interest," indicating her vested interest in the case's outcome, which suggests that the relief sought could have significant implications for her rights or interests in the matter at hand.

Duration: The case lasted from its filing on April 16, 2025, with all subsequent entries occurring on the same day, indicating that there were no further developments or extensions beyond that date. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was just one day.

Outcome: The case involved the filing of an affidavit, record, and a petition for a writ of mandamus on April 16, 2025, followed by submission on the same date. The docket does not provide information on the outcome of the petition or any subsequent orders from the court. Further details regarding the court's decision or any responses to the petition are necessary to determine the case's final resolution.

Complexity: The case is a mandamus action initiated on April 16, 2025, with the filing of the petition, affidavit, and record on the same day, indicating a potentially straightforward legal issue that may not involve extensive discovery or complex legal arguments. The prompt submission suggests readiness and possibly a clear basis for the relief sought, which typically characterizes less complex cases.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, as there are no mentions of expert witness reports or testimony. Morgan Michelle Myers is designated as the "real party in interest," which underscores her direct stake in the outcome of the petition for writ of mandamus, suggesting that the relief sought could significantly affect her rights or interests.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate the filing of a petition for writ of mandamus, which typically addresses a legal issue rather than a monetary claim. Since there are no specific amounts mentioned in the entries, it suggests that this case may not involve a direct monetary value or damages. Therefore, it is reasonable to estimate that the case is not significant from a monetary perspective, potentially indicating a non-monetary relief sought.

In re Charles Dustin Myers, Relator

Extract

Summary

Role: Morgan Michelle Myers is identified as the "Real party in interest" in the case, which typically indicates that she has a significant stake in the litigation but is not the primary plaintiff or defendant. Therefore, she is not classified as either the Plaintiff or Defendant in this context but rather holds an important role related to the interests being litigated.

Status: The docket entries indicate that multiple motions and filings were made on April 10, 2025, including a motion for emergency relief and a petition for writ of mandamus. Given that these actions suggest ongoing litigation and the case is still active, it has not yet finished or been closed.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be a petition for a writ of mandamus, indicating that the petitioner is seeking a court order to compel a governmental entity or official to perform a duty they are obligated to complete. The filing of a motion for emergency relief suggests urgency in the matter, while the inclusion of an affidavit indicates supporting evidence was presented alongside the petition. The specific factual background is not detailed in the docket entries, but the actions imply a dispute involving a failure to act or an improper exercise of discretion by a public authority.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case revolves around a petition for writ of mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, with key filings on April 10, 2025, including an emergency relief motion, record, and affidavit. Morgan Michelle Myers, designated as the "real party in interest" and represented by counsel Cooper Carter, indicates her significant stake in the outcome, as the relief sought directly affects her legal rights. The swift submission of these documents suggests a pressing need for judicial intervention regarding the matters at hand.

Duration: The case commenced on April 10, 2025, with the filing of a motion for emergency relief, alongside several other filings, including a petition for writ of mandamus. As no conclusion date is provided in the docket, the duration of the case from start to finish remains undetermined based on the available information.

Outcome: The docket indicates that on April 10, 2025, multiple significant legal actions were taken, including the filing of a motion for emergency relief, an affidavit, and a petition for writ of mandamus, alongside the submission of the record. The simultaneous filing of these documents suggests an urgent legal matter requiring immediate attention and potentially a higher court's intervention. The outcome of the case remains undetermined as the docket does not provide any subsequent rulings or decisions following these entries.

Complexity: The case is a mandamus action, indicating a request for a court order to compel a government official or entity to perform a duty. The filing of multiple documents, including a motion for emergency relief, record, affidavit, and the petition itself on the same day suggests urgency but also may point to a relatively straightforward legal issue. The lack of extensive procedural history or complex legal arguments in the docket entries implies that the case is not highly complex. Overall, the case appears to be focused and may hinge on specific legal criteria for mandamus relief.

Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, as there are no entries mentioning expert witnesses or expert reports. The primary parties include Charles Dustin Myers as the relator and Morgan Michelle Myers, represented by Cooper Carter, as the real party in interest. The relief sought through the petition for writ of mandamus directly affects Morgan Michelle Myers' legal rights or interests.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate procedural motions and filings, including a motion for emergency relief and a petition for writ of mandamus, but do not specify any monetary claims or damages. Therefore, without a specific amount mentioned, it is difficult to provide a precise monetary estimate for the case; it appears to focus more on urgent procedural issues rather than financial restitution.

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