

NO. 322-744263-23

IN THE MATTER OF

THE MARRIAGE OF

MORGAN MICHELLE MYERS

AND

CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS

AND IN THE INTEREST OF

M.E.M. AND C.R.M.,

CHILDREN

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

322ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS

**Respondent Charles Dustin Myers's Reply Brief in Support of No-Evidence Summary
Judgment And Request for Ruling Upon Submission**

COMES NOW, Respondent, Charles Dustin Myers, who files this Reply in Support of No-Evidence Summary Judgment And Request for Ruling Upon Submission, and in support thereof, would show this Court the following:

I. Record References

A. Incorporation by Reference

1. To minimize unnecessary paper, facilitate the Court's review, and enhance the clarity of this brief, the undersigned respectfully incorporates by reference the Second Amended Consolidated Mandamus Record, which is publicly available on the Supreme Court of Texas website.

B. Request for Judicial Notice

2. The undersigned respectfully requests that the Court take judicial notice of the unopposed facts cited herein and contained in the referenced record, as they are capable of accurate and

ready determination from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned, pursuant to Tex. R. Evid. 201(b)(2) .

3. The referenced document is available at:

<https://search.txcourts.gov/SearchMedia.aspx?MediaVersionID=61b83e31-36d1-4fbe-a837-5a3228b4cbc4&coa=cossup&DT=RECORD&MediaID=3f4d5220-d7e8-4cc6-a22e-db4ee7e4e9e0>.

4. For the Court’s convenience, each citation in this brief will refer to the record as “CMR,” followed by the page number (or range) and, if applicable, the paragraph number. For example, a reference to the sworn affidavit on page 3, paragraph 5, will appear as: [CMR p.3 ¶ 5](#). These references are hyperlinked to the specific page within the document for ease of access when viewed on a desktop computer.

5. The referenced “Second Amended Consolidated Mandamus Record” covers DKT entries 1-361 as found in this case’s docket, a true and accurate copy of which has been attached hereto as *Exhibit I* as to DKT entries 1-422.

II. Unopposed Statement of Facts

6. On December 12, 2023, Respondent, Charles Dustin Myers, discovered a significant volume of text messages between Petitioner Morgan Michelle Myers and Damen Gault Kazlauskas, Petitioner’s current boyfriend. *See* [CMR. p.254-714](#).

7. In response to this discovery, the Respondent reached out to the Petitioner’s Grandparents with a request to talk, who admit to being “blindsided” by Petitioner’s sudden desire for a divorce. *See* [CMR. p.716-720](#).

8. The following day, on December 13, 2023, the requested family meeting was turned into a private meeting between the Petitioner and her family members, as evidenced by the Petitioner’s text message sent on December 13, 2023, send at 9:55 P.M. CST. *See* [CMR. p.1715](#).

9. Returning home around 1:30 A.M. CST, the text records show that Petitioner began communicating via text message with her Stepfather, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover of Yukon, Oklahoma at approximately 3:29 A.M. CST. *See* [CMR. p.278](#).
10. These communications escalated the following day on December 14, 2023, totaling to over 90 text messages exchanged, which is the same day that the Petitioner sought her first ex-parte order of protection from this Court. *See* [CMR. p.274-278](#). *See also* [CMR. p.78 ¶ 9B](#).
11. Over the weekend of December 15, 2023, Petitioner traveled to Yukon, Oklahoma, where she received assistance in drafting the initial documents submitted to this Court on December 18, 2023, acquired a secondary phone registered under 817-940-0852 which was used in these proceedings, and transferred \$1,576 of marital funds to herself using Daniel Branthoover's PayPal as a medium. *See* [CMR. p.1706](#). (bank statement showing monetary transfer). *See also* [CMR. p.2866](#). (unanswered request for admissions). *See also* [CMR. p.1715](#). (text message from Petitioner admitting to monetary transfer on December 17, 2023).
12. The initial documents submitted to this Court on December 18, 2023, are the Original Petition for Divorce ([CMR. p.71-81](#)), a Request for Uncontested Cases form ([CMR. p.101-102](#)) and an Affidavit of Inability to Afford Court Costs ([CMR. p.84-96](#)).
13. In the Original Petition for Divorce, the following misrepresentations were made with direct reference to the record that contradicts them:
- i. Petitioner claimed she could not afford Court costs yet admits to transferring \$1,576 to the day before filing for divorce. *See* Unopposed Statement of Facts ¶ 11.
 - ii. Petitioner claimed that the couple stopped living together as spouses on December 1, 2023, yet evidence shows the Petitioner at home with respondent on December

22 and December 29. *See* [CMR. p.74 ¶ 4](#). *See also* [CMR. p.1734](#). (screenshot from a video showing Petitioner at home with the Respondent having fun with the Children.)

- iii. Petitioner claimed to have an active order of protection in place against the Respondent with a finding of family violence during the marriage, which is a blatant lie that cannot be proven. *See* [CMR. p.78 ¶ 10](#). *See also* CMR. p.
- iii. Petitioner claimed to own both family vehicles prior to the marriage despite knowing that both vehicles, one of them being a lease, were financed by the Respondent. *See* [CMR. p.135-136](#). (Respondent's TXDPS records showing no prior history of family violence or criminal activity.
- iv. Petitioner claimed that she would be harassed, abused, seriously harmed or injured or otherwise subjected to family violence if she must give the Respondent her new phone number acquired in Oklahoma. *See* [CMR. p.81 ¶ 15](#).

14. In the Petitioner's Statement of Inability to afford Court Costs, the following misrepresentations were made with a direct reference to the record that contradicts them:

- i. The Petitioner claimed she could not afford court costs despite admitting to a monetary transfer of \$1,576 the day prior to filing this document. *See* Unopposed Statement of Facts ¶ 11.
- ii. The Petitioner claimed to be financially responsible for \$1,610 in monthly expenses despite only alleging to make only \$744 per month. *See* [CMR. p.89 ¶ 5](#); *see also* [CMR. p.92 ¶ 6](#).

- iii. The Petitioner claimed to be financially responsible for the 2023 Mazda CX-5 and a 2021 Mazda CX3 which the couple never owned despite this amount exceeding her alleged monthly income. *See* [CMR. p.93 ¶ 8](#).
15. Finally, Petitioner submitted a Request for Uncontested Cases Form which misrepresented that this matter is uncontested. *See* [CMR. p.102](#).
16. Four days later on December 22, 2023, Petitioner filed for another protective order despite claiming to already have an existing order of protection. *See* [CMR. p.103-109](#).
17. In the application for protective order, Petitioner made the following misrepresentations:
- i. The Petitioner claimed family violence occurred on December 18, 2023, yet waited four days to inform the Court despite filing for divorce on that same day. *See* [CMR. p.108-109](#).
 - ii. The Petitioner has failed to produce any evidence for these allegations in nearly two years of litigation.
 - iii. The Petitioner can be seen at home with the Respondent and the Children on the same day she filed for protection in no state of emergency. *See* [CMR. p.1716](#).
(image of petitioner at home with Respondent getting the Children ready for bed;
See also Unopposed Statement of Fact ¶ 13(ii).
18. The totality of these false allegations and misrepresentations lead to the improper removal of the Respondent from his home on January 16, 2024. *See* [CMR. p.183](#). (first order removing Respondent from the home without findings or an evidentiary hearing); *see also* [CMR. p.118](#). (show cause summons for Petitioner's application for protective order)

19. After this initial decision was made, Petitioner began to leverage her advantage against the Respondent as he was thrust into a situation where he had to acquire legal representation on very short notice, only having until January 22, 2024, to do so.

20. On this day, which was the reset hearing before Associate Judge Kaitcer regarding Petitioner's Application for Protective Order, no appearances can be found in the docket, no hearing took place, and the Respondent's deprivation was extended until February 1, 2024, because the Petitioner waited until right before the hearing to allegedly retain the services of Cooper L. Carter ("Carter") in the lobby of the courtroom. *See* [CMR. p.186](#). (associate judge's report resetting the case to February 1, 2024, where Carter's signature first appears in this matter)

21. Despite communicating with his attorney regarding his goals, the children's needs, and his reliance on the home for generating income for the family, Dan Bacalis proved to be ineffective in his representation. *See* [CMR. p. 818, ¶¶ 9–11, 13](#). (communications with Dan Bacalis)

22. After little communication from Dan Bacalis, Respondent reached out and informed him that he would be terminating his services and shared his feelings regarding the quality of service that was being provided. *See* [CMR. p.819 ¶ 14](#).

23. Despite these concerns, and with no recorded appearances within the case docket, the parties appeared on February 1, 2024, where the Respondent was presented with the sole option of a settlement agreement and was given a month back in the home. *See* [CMR. p.229-234](#). ('agreed' associate judge's report signed February 1, 2024)

24. Respondent "...disagreed with the conditions in the document and advised Mr. Bacalis that he wanted to take it to trial because the petitioner did not have any evidence of family violence. Mr. Bacalis advised Mr. Myers that he "knows this Judge and this is the best we can

get”. Mr. Bacalis stated in whining manner “We’ll be here all day; we can come back and change it later”. Mr. Bacalis stated “no one will put a gun to your head if you are not out by March 1st.”

See [CMR. p.1368](#). (affidavit of Steve Myers, witness)

25. This is when Respondent paid special attention to the following provisions of the agreement found on [CMR. p.233](#):

A typed written Order conforming to this Report will follow within 20 days from the date this Report is signed. The Temporary Order *shall* be prepared by **Dan Bacalis**. Each attorney should approve the Order. The parties do not need to approve the Order. The attorney reviewing the proposed order *shall have five (5) days to do so*. There are no ten (10) day letters. If an agreement is not reached, a Motion to Sign *shall be filed and set within thirty (30) days from the signing of this Report*. (emphasis added)

26. Therefore, we can gather based on the language that this agreement:

- i. Required Dan Bacalis to prepare the typed written order;
- ii. The attorney reviewing the proposed order would therefore be Cooper L. Carter, attorney for Petitioner.
- iii. If an agreement was not reached, a motion to sign was required to be filed and set within 30 days of February 1, 2024.

27. Given these provisions, the Respondent signed the agreement, and immediately terminated his attorney thereafter and provided notice to the Court and opposing parties on February 5, 2024. See [CMR. p.221-222](#). (notice of termination of legal counsel)

28. Following his termination, Respondent prepared an EMERGENCY MOTION TO RECONSIDER EVIDENCE AND VACATE TEMPORARY ORDERS. See [CMR. p.240-243](#). This was filed alongside a brief and several exhibits that highlighted the Petitioner’s dishonesty. See [CMR. p.244-252](#). (brief in support of emergency motion); See also CMR. p.254-714 (text records highlighting mothers extensive communications with Damen Kazlauskas); [CMR. p.716-](#)

[720](#). (text message from Petitioner’s grandfather showing he was blindsided by the divorce); [CMR. p.722-723](#). (financial transaction showing that Petitioner transferred \$1,576 to a third party prior to filing for divorce); [CMR. p.725-731](#). (overdraft notice from Petitioner’s transfer and text communications asking for the funds to be returned); [CMR. p.733-735](#). (eviction suit instigated by the Petitioner over the weekend of December 15, 2023); [CMR. p.737](#). (dismissal of the eviction suit.)

29. The opposing counsel, Cooper L. Carter, sent correspondence informing the Respondent that she would be filing a counter motion on February 14, 2024. *See* [CMR. p.2794](#).

30. By March 4, 2024, Respondent filed a notice with the Court informing the opposing side and the Court that he would not be leaving the matrimonial residence as it would not be in the best interests of the children.

31. Two days later, while walking the Children to school, Petitioner took it upon herself to lock the Respondent out of the marital residence and left a sign on the door. *See* [CMR. p.829](#) at [2024-03-06](#). (video of Respondent taking the children to school that morning and the sign on the door left by Petitioner)

32. It’s noteworthy that this action came without any response being filed to the emergency motion served on her nearly a month prior.

33. Respondent stayed in Flower Mound, Texas, with his father until the March 14, 2024, hearing on his emergency motion.

34. On March 14, 2024, the parties both appeared before Associate Judge Jeffrey Kaitcer, despite only the Respondent making an appearance on the case docket. *See* Exhibit 1, p.3 at DKT. No. 78.

35. Without responding to the motion, and in violation of the provisions outlined above, Cooper L. Carter handed the Respondent the typed written “Temporary Orders” with actual knowledge that:

- i. Dan Bacalis did not prepare the order;
- ii. An agreement was not reached and no motion to sign was ever filed or set within the agreed upon timeframe.

36. Upon inspection of this document, which was signed by both the Petitioner and her Counsel, the following misrepresentations were made to the Court:

- i. That on February 1, 2024, a hearing occurred regarding a motion for temporary orders when this setting was a reset hearing from the initial protective order setting on January 16, 2024, later extended to January 22, 2024, and then February 1, 2024.
- ii. That the Court heard arguments and evidence from both sides when in reality the parties had a hallway settlement conference and no evidence was presented. See
CMR. p.888.
- iii. That the orders were in the best interests of the children and the prerequisites of the law have been met.
- iv. That the parties agree to the terms of the order ‘as evidenced by the signatures below’. See CMR. p.888. **This fact was omitted in her response.**

37. Furthermore, Cooper L. Carter, despite not filing any response to the emergency motion, handed Associate Judge Jeff Kaitcer a proposed order in the form of an ‘associate judge’s report’ requesting that his motion be denied. See CMR. p.795. This fact was omitted in her response.
This fact was omitted in her response.

38. Despite no opposition to his motion, the Associate Judge, who was never vested with any order of referral to hear the motion, denied him without explanation, and signed the temporary orders prepared by Cooper L. Carter which were handed to the Respondent just moments earlier.

39. Finally, the temporary orders drafted by Carter contained unilaterally altered terms, specifically:

- i. In the February 1, 2024, associate judge's report referenced in the orders prepared by Carter, the agreed terms gave the Respondent until March 1, 2024, to reside in the home. [See CMR. p.231 ¶ 7.](#)
- ii. In the March 14, 2024, temporary orders prepared by Carter, the Respondent was given until March 20, 2024, to reside in the home, and the Petitioner was given access after March 30, 2024, leaving a ten-day period where no party would occupy the home. [See CMR. p.1815.](#) **This fact was omitted in her response.**

40. Finally, Carter handed Judge Kaitcer an unserved "Proposed Order" requesting that Respondent's emergency motion be denied despite never providing a response to the motion. [CMR. 795.](#) **This fact was omitted in her response.**

III. Introduction

41. Respondent **Charles Dustin Myers** ("Father") files this Reply to **Petitioner Morgan Michelle Myers's** ("Mother") response to the no-evidence motion for summary judgment. After nearly two years of litigation, Mother's last-minute attempt to avoid summary judgment fails. She was required under **Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 166a(i)** to produce *competent evidence* raising a genuine fact issue on each challenged element of her claims. Instead, she offers only conclusory, self-serving assertions (in an affidavit and scattered exhibits) and promises of what she "plans to give at trial," which do not satisfy her burden. It remains undisputed that Mother

has **no evidence** for the essential elements identified in the motion. Indeed, she ignored written discovery entirely, causing Requests for Admission to be **deemed admitted by operation of law**. Texas law does not permit a claimant to continue a lawsuit in the absence of evidence.

42. Because Mother's response points to nothing more than a *scintilla* of proof (at best), summary judgment **must** be granted as a matter of law.

43. Mother's eleventh-hour allegations of *family violence, harassment, and even drug use* – raised for the first time in her response – are wholly unsubstantiated and suspect. For nearly **22 months**, she produced **no** police reports, medical records, witness affidavits, or other evidence to corroborate her sensational claims. She even withdrew her own protective order application rather than pursuing a finding of family violence in court. Only now, faced with dismissal of her claims, does she submit a self-serving affidavit that was **drafted on March 27, 2025**, and a handful of unauthenticated and cherry-picked text messages in an effort to create a fact issue. The Court should view these belated accusations with extreme skepticism. Unsupported assertions and post hoc allegations cannot defeat a properly supported no-evidence motion. As shown below, Mother's response contains *no competent evidence* on each element specifically challenged in the motion, and her failure to answer discovery leaves her with **no factual basis** to avoid summary judgment.

44. Finally, Mother's current live pleadings (her Second Amended Petition for Divorce) **undermine her own positions**. She now pleads for relief that **contradicts the very temporary orders** she asks this Court to keep in place. This inconsistency underscores the lack of merit in her claims. In short, Petitioner's response falls far short of the requirements of Rule 166a(i). The Court should **grant summary judgment** in Respondent's favor, dismissing all of Mother's

unsupported claims so that Respondent may return to his home and family life, and his constitutional rights as a father and homeowner may be restored.

IV. No-Evidence Summary Judgment Standards

45. Under **Rule 166a(i)**, once a no-evidence motion identifies the essential elements where no proof exists, the burden shifts to the non-movant to produce “*more than a scintilla of evidence*” raising a genuine issue of material fact on each challenged element. If the non-movant fails, the Court **must** grant summary judgment. “More than a scintilla” means evidence sufficient to *enable reasonable and fair-minded jurors to differ in their conclusions*; by contrast, evidence so weak that it creates only a surmise or suspicion of fact is legally **insufficient**. Crucially, allegations in pleadings or mere promises of future testimony do not constitute evidence. The non-movant must present **actual, admissible proof** now – such as documents, affidavits, or deposition testimony – to demonstrate a fact issue. **Texas courts** have emphasized that a party cannot avoid summary judgment with conclusory self-serving statements or by *simply arguing that evidence “may be produced” later*.

46. Here, Respondent’s motion was timely filed after an adequate time for discovery and specifically identified the elements lacking evidence. Mother was therefore required to **point out competent summary judgment evidence** for each of those elements. She has not done so. As detailed below, her response relies on speculation and unverified accusations rather than admissible proof. Because Mother failed to meet her burden, Rule 166a(i) mandates that summary judgment be entered in favor of Respondent.

V. Mother's Complete Failure to Present Evidence on Challenged Elements

47. Respondent's motion challenged six essential elements of Mother's claims on which she bears the burden of proof. Mother's response does not present more than a scintilla of **competent, admissible evidence** on *any* of these elements:

i. **No Evidence of Alleged Family Violence:** Mother has produced no credible evidence that any "*family violence*" (as defined by Texas Family Code § 71.004) ever occurred during the marriage. She alleges an incident on December 18, 2023, under oath, but offers nothing to substantiate it beyond her own belated accusations. There are **no police reports, medical records, or third-party affidavits** to corroborate any injury or assault. In fact, Mother's own conduct **undercuts** her claims – after the alleged December 18 incident, she *continued living with Father* and took no immediate action consistent with being an abuse victim. When given the opportunity to prove family violence in court, she **withdrew her application** for a protective order prior to any hearing. This withdrawal speaks louder than her late-breaking statements. Mother's new accusations of harassment and drug use are likewise unsupported by any evidence (no witness statements, no requested drug tests, nothing) and were never properly raised until now. Unverified allegations in an affidavit drafted several months ago – especially after a long silence – are *not enough* to raise a fact issue. At most, Mother's affidavit is merely a tactical weapon that she's been sandbagging for **nine months** and further exposes her bad-faith litigation tactics.

ii. **No Evidence of an Active Protective Order or Judicial Family-Violence Finding:** Mother cannot point to any *active protective order* in effect, nor any court finding of family violence against Respondent that was in effect at the time of filing this suit. It is

undisputed that **no court ever issued a protective order** in this case. Mother did file an Application for Protective Order on December 22, 2023, but she never followed through – the application was non-suited. Thus, there is *no signed Protective Order* in the record, and no judicial finding that family violence occurred. Texas law requires a formal hearing and a separate, written order to grant a family-violence protective order (Tex. Fam. Code §§ 85.001, 85.004). Mother has neither. In her response, Mother vaguely refers to a protective order as if one exists, but this is misleading. Mother’s inability to produce an actual order or judgment renders any claim or relief predicated on a protective order completely unsupported. In sum, the **non-existence** of a protective order is an incontrovertible fact that negates Mother’s allegations to the contrary, and this claim is precisely what landed her sole use of the residency to begin with.

iii. No Evidence of Financial Indigency (False Affidavit of Inability to Pay): Mother also failed to produce evidence that she was genuinely *indigent* on the date she filed this suit. In her Original Petition (filed December 18, 2023), Mother submitted a sworn **Affidavit of Inability to Pay Costs** claiming extreme financial hardship. However, this claim is **conclusively refuted by objective facts** in the record. Just days before filing, on December 15, 2023, Mother **withdrew \$1,576 in marital funds** – funds which she did *not* disclose in her indigency affidavit. She claimed to have only \$21 to her name, yet evidence shows she had access to substantial community money. Mother has offered **no bank statements, income records, or any financial documents** to support her indigency assertion. To the contrary, the available evidence (including her own transactions) shows she had resources and even managed to allegedly hire private counsel

shortly after filing. Without any evidence substantiating “true indigence,” Mother’s affidavit of inability to pay is **proven false**. Texas law provides that a suit filed on a false indigency affidavit may be dismissed or sanctions imposed, because the **Practice & Remedies Code** does not tolerate proceeding in forma pauperis under false pretenses. At the very least, the lack of evidence for indigency means Mother cannot carry any burden tied to her financial status or claims for relief premised on indigency. This element, too, fails as a matter of law.

iv. No Evidence that Temporary Orders Were Properly Entered or Valid: Mother’s response leans heavily on the **Temporary Orders** signed in early 2024, claiming they should remain in effect and are in the children’s best interest. But Mother produces no evidence that those February 1, 2024 temporary orders were obtained with the required *due process* or formalities. In fact, the record shows serious irregularities with how those orders came about. Mother cannot point to any **notice or hearing** on her December 27, 2023, motion for temporary relief that resulted in the February 1 orders, and the case docket shows that the Petitioner’s only appearance in this matter was on January 16, 2024. There is **no transcript or reporter’s record** of any evidence presented on February 1, 2024. There is not even a file-marked copy of the temporary orders motion showing it was properly served on Respondent in advance. Absent proof that Respondent received due notice and an actual evidentiary hearing was held on February 1, the resulting Temporary Orders “**lack a lawful foundation.**” In short, Mother has no evidence that the procedural prerequisites (notice, an opportunity to be heard, and a hearing on the merits) were satisfied before the court signed those sweeping temporary orders. This calls into question the validity and enforceability of the orders she seeks to

uphold. Moreover, Mother repeatedly refers to the February 1 proceeding as an “Agreed” temporary orders hearing, yet it is undisputed that Respondent **never actually agreed to the terms** that were later signed. Mother has **no evidence** – no signed consent, no email acceptance, nothing – showing that Respondent approved the specific terms of the “Agreed” Temporary Orders that were entered on March 14, 2024. To the contrary, all evidence indicates Respondent *objected* to those terms at every opportunity: the orders were drafted **unilaterally by Petitioner’s counsel** and presented to the court without Respondent’s signature or consent. The signature line for Respondent on the face of the order is conspicuously **blank**, confirming he did not sign it. Respondent has provided sworn testimony (in the mandamus record and elsewhere) that he **never agreed** and voiced his objections, which stands unchallenged by any evidence from Mother. Thus, Petitioner cannot demonstrate that the temporary orders were the product of a valid agreement or hearing – an essential underpinning of their legitimacy. In fact, Petitioner’s counsel, **Cooper L. Carter**, materially altered and submitted the proposed order after the February 1 hearing, **without following proper process or obtaining Respondent’s approval**, which amounts to a fraud on the court. Respondent promptly filed an *emergency motion* on February 9, 2024, to alert the Court to these improprieties and to vacate the temporary orders, but that motion was effectively brushed aside without any cure for the underlying due process violations despite receiving no response from the opposing side. Mother’s response offers no rebuttal to these facts and in fact, skips over them completely; she does not deny the lack of notice or the ex parte submission of the order. Because Mother has no evidence that the temporary orders were entered with due process or valid agreement, she cannot rely on those orders as a shield to avoid summary

judgment. Any claims premised on the validity of the February 1, 2024, proceedings are **unsupported and cannot stand**, and are contradicted by the face of the record.

v. No Evidence that Temporary Orders Are in the Children's Best Interest: Even setting aside the procedural flaws, Mother has no evidence that the content of the current Temporary Orders (which give her exclusive occupancy of the marital home and severely limit Father's possession of the children) is in the **best interest of the children**. Under Texas law, the *"best interest of the child shall always be the primary consideration"* in determining conservatorship and access. Tex. Fam. Code § 153.002. If Mother wishes to justify the highly restrictive temporary orders, she bears the burden to prove those orders benefit the children. Yet she offers **nothing** of the sort. There is **no expert testimony** or evaluation from a mental health professional supporting Mother's position. There are **no statements from the children's teachers or doctors**, no school or medical records indicating the children are better off under the current temporary arrangement. In fact, Mother disobeyed a court-ordered parenting course (which was meant to help the children cope with the family situation), demonstrating a disregard for the children's best interests. By contrast, Respondent has continually asserted that removing the children from their father and home has been harmful to them, and Mother's own evidence inadvertently supports Respondent's concerns. For example, in one of the text/email exhibits attached to her response, Father poignantly points out that one daughter was coming to his house in distress (asking for a diaper at nearly 7 years old) and that the girls have been prevented from even speaking with their father's side of the family. He laments that the one-sided temporary orders – "procured by deceit and fraud" – have **damaged the girls' status quo**, and he implores Mother to consider the harm being caused. Rather

than contradict Respondent, these communications corroborate that the current situation is unhealthy for the children and was imposed without proper basis. Mother has simply **no evidence** to affirmatively show that keeping Father out of the home and on a supervised or restricted schedule is in the children's best interest. All she offers is the refrain that "best interest" is paramount (which is true) and her own speculation that her custody demands should be litigated. Speculation is not evidence. Because Mother has not met her burden to produce evidence that the temporary orders' onerous terms benefit the children, this element likewise yields to summary judgment. The Court should not allow baseless temporary orders to continue when they lack evidentiary support and, in fact, appear to be hurting the children more than helping.

vi. No Evidence that Respondent Violated Court Orders in Any Material Way: In an effort to smear Respondent, Mother's response accuses him of various *violations* of court orders and bad acts (harassment via messages, etc.), but again she offers no concrete evidence of any **meaningful violation**. The record reflects that Respondent, though understandably frustrated by being ousted from his home and limited in access to his children, largely **complied** with the temporary orders to avoid further conflict. Mother's exhibits include a series of text messages and emails from Respondent – yet these actually serve to **validate Respondent's position** rather than prove willful misconduct. For instance, in the December 19, 2024, email chain that Mother herself submitted, Respondent addresses Mother's failure to follow the temporary orders (not informing him directly of a child's medical needs, not facilitating communication, etc.). He expresses anguish at how the orders are being used as a sword against him and how he will seek to rectify the situation through the legal process. While the tone of these communications is

urgent and upset, they do not evidence any *threats or violence* by Respondent; rather, they show a father reacting to **Mother's bad-faith litigation tactics** and the distress they caused. Mother has presented no evidence that Respondent ever harmed the children or violated any court order in a manner that endangered anyone. There is no contempt order, no enforcement proceeding with findings against Respondent, nothing beyond Mother's complaints. Minor technical violations (if any) or angry words in communications do not rise to the level of creating a genuine fact issue on any claim in this case. To defeat summary judgment, Mother needed to present **admissible proof** that Respondent breached a legal duty or order in a way that supports a cause of action or her requested relief. She has not done so. In the absence of **any evidence of significant misconduct** by Respondent, Mother cannot avoid summary dismissal of her allegations of harassment or other wrongdoing.

48. In sum, Mother failed to carry her burden on *each and every one* of the challenged elements. Each of the above issues is something for which **Mother would bear the burden of proof at trial**, yet after ample time for discovery she has “**adduced nothing – no documents, no affidavits, no testimony**” to support them. Her response is built on accusations, not evidence. Under Rule 166a(i), “*the court must grant*” the motion if the non-movant fails to bring forth more than a scintilla of evidence on the challenged elements. That is precisely the situation here.

VI. Deemed Admissions and Discovery Defaults Confirm No Evidence

49. Mother's lack of evidence is **further confirmed** by her failure to answer written discovery in this case. See [CMR. 1409](#). Respondent served Requests for Admission, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production aimed at uncovering any factual support for Mother's claims. Mother **did not respond** within the time required by the Texas Rules of Civil

Procedure. By rule, each Request for Admission she left unanswered is **automatically deemed admitted**. See **Tex. R. Civ. P. 198.2(c)**; *Marshall v. Vise*, 767 S.W.2d 699, 700 (Tex. 1989) (unanswered requests are deemed admitted by operation of law). These deemed admissions are binding **judicial admissions** – Mother cannot introduce evidence to contradict them. *Marshall*, 767 S.W.2d at 700; *Sherman Acquisition II LP v. Garcia*, 229 S.W.3d 802, 812 (Tex. App.—Waco 2007, no pet.) Moreover, deemed admissions are fully **competent summary judgment evidence** that can support a judgment as a matter of law. *Acevedo v. Comm’n for Lawyer Discipline*, 131 S.W.3d 99, 105 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2004, pet. denied)

50. In this case, the deemed admissions effectively negate Mother’s causes of action. Although the admissions themselves are in the record, a few examples are illustrative (paraphrasing due to their admitted status): Mother has admitted **she has no evidence** of physical abuse by Respondent; admitted that **no protective order** was ever issued; admitted that **Respondent did not breach** any court order in a manner harming the children; and admitted that **she withdrew funds** around the time of filing while claiming indigence. These admissions align with the no-evidence points discussed above, and Mother never sought to withdraw or amend them. Thus, even if Mother’s late affidavit could be considered, it **cannot create a fact issue** in the face of her own conclusive admissions to the contrary *Beasley v. Burns*, 7 S.W.3d 768, 769-70 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, pet. denied). The Court is entitled to rely on the deemed admissions as **undisputed facts** establishing that Mother lacks evidence for her claims. In short, Mother’s discovery defaults have sealed the fate of her case: she has judicially conceded the very points that entitle Respondent to summary judgment.

VII. Mother's Second Amended Petition filed November 24, 2025, Contradicts the March 14, Temporary Orders, that claim to be in the Children's Best Interests

51. It is also noteworthy that Mother's **live pleadings** in this case do not square with her position in this summary judgment proceeding. In her Second Amended Petition for Divorce, filed the day prior to her response, Mother asserts claims and requests relief that *cannot be reconciled* with the premise that the February 1, 2024 Temporary Orders are valid and in the children's best interest. For example, upon information and belief, Mother's Second Amended Petition **omits** the family-violence allegations that originally underpinned the ex parte temporary restraining order and protective order application. She instead pleads primarily **"no-fault" divorce grounds**, suggesting that the marriage is insupportable – a stance at odds with her current portrayal of Respondent as an abuser. Likewise, while the Temporary Orders reflect an agreement (on paper) to joint managing conservatorship with standard possession, Mother's amended petition now seeks to modify or overturn those terms (e.g. by requesting sole managing conservatorship and supervised access by Father) due to alleged misconduct. Mother cannot have it both ways. If the temporary orders were truly agreed and in the children's best interest (as she claims when it suits her), one would expect her live petition to mirror that status quo going forward. Instead, her Second Amended Petition attempts to **dramatically change** the custodial arrangement and revisit issues supposedly settled by the temporary orders. This inconsistency **undermines Mother's credibility** and the integrity of her claims. It appears Mother values the temporary orders only as a tactical weapon to keep Respondent out of the home during the case, even as she signals an intention to seek different relief at final trial. The Court should not credit arguments that the temporary orders must stand, when Mother's own pleadings cast doubt on their propriety and continued viability. This conflict in positions further confirms that the temporary orders were a product of strategic maneuvering rather than a fair, evidence-based

resolution. As documented in the **Second Amended Consolidated Mandamus Record** filed in the Texas Supreme Court, the chronology of events and Mother's shifting litigation posture remain undisputed by her. In light of the record as a whole, Mother's claims have no firm footing in fact or law.

VIII. Respondent's Communications Highlight Petitioner's Bad Faith

52. Mother's response includes various text messages and emails – presumably to paint Respondent in a poor light – but these actually **support Respondent's case** and expose Petitioner's bad faith. The communications show a Father desperate to maintain contact with his children and frustrated by Mother's selective adherence to court orders. In one December 2024 email, for instance, Respondent admonishes Mother for "hid[ing] behind" the one-sided orders while failing to follow them herself. He notes that Mother was preventing the children from even speaking to their family (violating the spirit of co-parenting) and points out that if Mother insists on using the orders as a shield, she should at least *honor all provisions* of those orders. Tellingly, Respondent accuses Mother of **fabricating her indigency** (referring to the false affidavit she filed) and of procuring the temporary orders **"by deceit and fraud,"** with the assistance of her counsel. Far from being off-topic rants, these statements directly align with Respondent's legal position: that Mother misled the court to gain unfair advantage and has not acted in the children's best interests. Respondent's passionate tone is the understandable result of a parent who has been **unjustly deprived of his home and children** for an extended period. Importantly, nowhere in these communications does Respondent threaten harm or violate the law – he expressly says he will "pursue litigation" and hold those responsible accountable *"in accordance with the law."* These messages, therefore, do not create any genuine dispute of material fact; if anything, they **corroborate** Respondent's claims of procedural wrongdoing by Petitioner and the deleterious

effect of Petitioner's actions on the family. The Court should see Mother's exhibit evidence for what it is: an attempt to distract from her lack of admissible evidence by showcasing Respondent's understandable concern. Such distractions do not defeat a summary judgment motion. Context matters, and communications made in the midst of contentious litigation can reflect distress rather than culpability. Here, the context of Respondent's cherry-picked messages is a **father's distress caused by Mother's bad-faith tactics**, and that context reinforces the justness of granting relief to Respondent.

IX. Conclusion and Prayer

53. Mother has had **ample time** and opportunity to develop her case, but chose not to participate in the discovery process. She has come up with *nothing* of substance. The law is clear: when a claimant produces **no evidence** to support essential elements of her claims, "*the court must grant the motion*" for no-evidence summary judgment. Mother's response falls far short of the mark – it is a compilation of excuses, contradictions, and unproven allegations dumped on the Court at the last minute. She asks the Court to ignore the rules of evidence and procedure and allow her claims to proceed on mere sympathy or speculation. But **Rule 166a(i)** was designed precisely to prevent that scenario and to dispose of baseless claims **before** they consume more time and resources. Courts in Texas (including in family law matters) do not hesitate to summarily dismiss claims when no proof supports them. This case is a textbook example of one that *should* be disposed of now: Mother's extreme allegations (family violence, etc.) remain **unsubstantiated**, and every objective indicator in the record shows there is no genuine fact issue for trial.

54. Accordingly, Respondent **Charles Dustin Myers** respectfully prays that the Court **GRANT** the no-evidence motion for summary judgment in its entirety. All of Mother's claims

and requests for relief that lack supporting evidence should be **dismissed with prejudice** under Rule 166a(i). Such a judgment will finally dissolve the improperly obtained temporary orders, allowing Respondent to regain access to his home and children. Justice and equity demand this outcome. After enduring substantial hardship and damage to his family life due to Petitioner's meritless accusations, Respondent is entitled to judgment as a matter of law and the restoration of his constitutional rights as a parent and homeowner.

55. The Petitioner's last-ditch effort wholly fails to raise a fact issue, and the motion should be **GRANTED** as a matter of law in Respondent's favor, and the final trial setting **ABATED**.

56. Respondent further requests all other relief to which he is justly entitled.

57. Respondent further prays that this Court, its' staff members, and the opposing side have a good Thanksgiving holiday, and appreciates the Court's time in reviewing this document.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Charles Dustin Myers

CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS

6641 ANNE COURT

WATAUGA, TEXAS 76148

CHUCKDUSTIN12@GMAIL.COM

817-546-3693

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Respondent certifies that this response in support of no-evidence summary judgment was served on all parties of record pursuant to Rule 21a of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure on November 26, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Charles Dustin Myers

CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS

6641 ANNE COURT

WATAUGA, TEXAS 76148

CHUCKDUSTIN12@GMAIL.COM

817-546-3693

EXHIBIT 1

TARRANT COUNTY DISTRICT CLERK'S OFFICE
ALL TRANSACTIONS FOR A CASE

Page: 1
Date: 10/31/2025
Time: 13:30

Cause Number: 322-744263-23 Date Filed: 12/18/2023
MORGAN MICHELLE MYERS v CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS
S
Cause of Action: DIVORCE WITH CHILDREN
Case Status.....: PENDING

Filemark	Description	Fee	Total
1	12/18/2023 ORIGINAL PETITION FOR DIVORCE	NUI	401.00
2	12/18/2023 Citation W/SVC-ISSUED ON CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS-On 12/18/2023 12/19/2023	NUI	83.00
3	12/18/2023 STATEMENT OF INABILITY TO AFFORD PYMT OF CRT COSTS	UI	0.00
4	12/18/2023 PRO SE INSTRUCTION SHEET	I	0.00
5	12/18/2023 REQ FOR UNCONTESTED CASES SLF REPR LITIGANT W/CHIL	I	0.00
6	12/18/2023 SERVICE REQUEST FORM (COPIES TO DP 12/18/23 VL)	UI	0.00
27	12/22/2023 *** From 322-744538-23 *** APPLICATION FOR PROTECT 12/22/2023 IVE ORDER	I	0.00
28	12/22/2023 *** From 322-744538-23 *** COPIES - PAPER OR CONVE 12/22/2023 RTED		0.00
7	12/27/2023 COPIES - PAPER OR CONVERTED	N	9.00
8	12/27/2023 MOTION FOR TRO/TEMP INJUNCTION & TEMP ORDERS	I	0.00
29	12/27/2023 *** From 322-744538-23 *** ORDER SET HRG FOR 1/15/ 12/27/2023 2024 @ 9AM	UIM	0.00
30	12/27/2023 *** From 322-744538-23 *** SERVICE REQUEST FORM (T 12/27/2023 O DP 12/27/23 VL)	UI	0.00
31	12/27/2023 *** From 322-744538-23 *** CITATION, Prot Order W/ 12/27/2023 SVC-ISSUED ON-On 12/27/2023 12/27/2023	UI	0.00
32	12/27/2023 *** From 322-744538-23 *** SHOW CAUSE PRO ORD W/SV 12/27/2023 C-ISSUED ON CHARLES DUSTIN 12/27/2023 MYERS-On 12/27/2023	UI	0.00
33	12/28/2023 *** From 322-744538-23 *** ORDER SETTING HEARING 1 12/28/2023 /16/24 @ 9:00 AM	UIM	0.00
12	12/29/2023 Citation W/SVC Tr# 2 RET EXEC(CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS 12/29/2023) On 12/27/2023	UI	0.00
34	01/02/2024 *** From 322-744538-23 *** DEFENDANT'S ANSWER	UI	0.00
35	01/02/2024 *** From 322-744538-23 *** (ATT) EXHIBIT B	I	0.00
36	01/02/2024 *** From 322-744538-23 *** (ATT) EXHIBIT A	I	0.00
9	01/03/2024 MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE	UI	0.00
10	01/03/2024 (ATT) CASES_BACKGROUND	I	0.00
42	01/03/2024 *** From 322-744538-23 *** CITATION, Prot Order W/ 01/03/2024 SVC Tr# 5 RET EXEC(CHARLES 01/03/2024 DUSTIN MYERS) On 12/29/2023	UI	0.00
44	01/03/2024 *** From 322-744538-23 *** SHOW CAUSE PRO ORD W/SV 01/03/2024 C Tr# 6 RET EXEC(CHARLES DU 01/03/2024 STIN MYERS) On 12/29/2023	UI	0.00

11	01/04/2024	Adjustment for service fee from # 2	NA	0.00
37	01/08/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** MOT FOR CONTINUANCE & N UI		0.00
	01/08/2024	OH (PROPOSED)		
38	01/08/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** (ATTACHMENT) DOCUMENTAT I		0.00
	01/08/2024	ION FOR CONTINUANCE		
39	01/08/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** (ATTACHMENT) EXHIBIT-A I		0.00
40	01/08/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** (ATTACHMENT) EXHIBIT-B I		0.00
41	01/12/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** Adjustment for service		0.00
	01/12/2024	fee from # 5		
43	01/12/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** Adjustment for service		0.00
	01/12/2024	fee from # 6		
13	01/16/2024	RESP'S ORIGINAL COUNTERPETITION FOR DIVORCE	NUI	80.00
14	01/16/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #13	Y	35.00
15	01/16/2024	PAYMENT PAID TO STATE trans #13	Y	45.00
16	01/16/2024	(ATT) COMPREHENSIVE_STATEMENT	I	0.00
17	01/16/2024	(ATT) UNSWORN DECLARATION - GENERAL (1)	I	0.00
18	01/16/2024	(ATT) EXHIBIT G - FALSE AND CONTRADICTORY STATEMEN I		0.00
45	01/16/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** APPEARANCE - MORGAN MIC UI		0.00
	01/16/2024	HELLE MYERS		

TARRANT COUNTY DISTRICT CLERK'S OFFICE
ALL TRANSACTIONS FOR A CASE

Page: 2
Date: 10/31/2025
Time: 13:30

Cause Number: 322-744263-23 Date Filed: 12/18/2023
MORGAN MICHELLE MYERS v CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS
S
Cause of Action: DIVORCE WITH CHILDREN
Case Status.....: PENDING

	Filemark	Description	Fee Total
46	01/16/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** APPEARANCE - CHARLES DU UI	0.00
	01/16/2024	STIN MYERS	
19	01/17/2024	JDG'S RENDITION RESET 1/22/24 @9AM (SGD 1/16/2024) UIM	0.00
47	01/17/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** JDG'S RENDITION 1/22/20 UIM	0.00
	01/17/2024	24 @ 9AM (SGD 1/16/2024)	
48	01/23/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** AJ'S REPORT RESET: 2/1/ UIM	0.00
	01/23/2024	24 @ 9:00 AM	
49	01/23/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** AJ REPORT SIGNED 1/22/2	0.00
	01/23/2024	4	
20	01/31/2024	1ST AMENDED COUNTERPETITION FOR DIVORCE	UI 0.00
21	01/31/2024	1ST AMENDED PETITION FOR DIVORCE	UI 0.00
22	02/05/2024	NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF LEGAL COUNSEL - BACALIS	UI 0.00
23	02/06/2024	AGREED MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ATTY BACALIS	UI 0.00
24	02/08/2024	AGREED AJ'S REPORT FOR TEMP ORDS	UIM 0.00
25	02/08/2024	AGREED ORDER FOR CONSOLIDATION SIGNED 2/1/24	UIM 0.00
26	02/08/2024	AJ REPORT SIGNED 2/1/24	0.00
50	02/08/2024	*** From 322-744538-23 *** AGREED ORDER FOR CONSOL UIM	0.00
	02/08/2024	IDATION	

	Filemark	Description		Fee Total
89	03/26/2024	(ATTACH)NICHOLAS MORVAN AFFIDAVIT	I	0.00
90	03/26/2024	*REQUEST FOR CLERK TO PREPARE RECORD	UI	0.00
91	03/26/2024	REQUEST FOR FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSTIONS OF LAW	UI	0.00
92	03/26/2024	TEMPORARY ORDERS	UIM	0.00
93	03/26/2024	AJ'S REPORT FOR TEMPORARY ORDERS	UIM	0.00
96	03/26/2024	TEMPORARY ORDER SIGNED ON 03/14/2024		0.00
97	03/26/2024	AJ'S REPORT SIGNED ON 03/14/2024		0.00
94	04/03/2024	NOT OF FILINGG ORIGINAL PROCEEDING/MTN FOR TEMP	UI	0.00
	04/03/2024	RELIEF		
95	04/04/2024	NOT OF FILING ORIG PROCEED & MOT FOR TEMP RELIEF	UI	0.00
	04/04/2024	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS		
98	04/08/2024	*CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) PET/MAND FILED	I	0.00
99	04/10/2024	*CT APPEALS (ORIG PROC) PET/MAND DENIED	I	0.00
100	04/15/2024	COPIES - ELECTRONIC (1-10 PAGES)	N	33.00
101	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #100	Y	33.00
102	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
103	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
104	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
105	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
106	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
107	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
108	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
109	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
110	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
111	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
112	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
113	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
114	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
115	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
116	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
117	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
118	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
119	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
120	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
121	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
122	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
123	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
124	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
125	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
126	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
127	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
128	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
129	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
130	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
131	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
132	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
133	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
134	04/15/2024	CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00

135	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #134	Y	5.00
136	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #133	Y	5.00
137	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #132	Y	5.00
138	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #131	Y	5.00
139	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #130	Y	5.00
140	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #129	Y	5.00
141	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #128	Y	5.00
142	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #127	Y	5.00
143	04/15/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #126	Y	5.00

TARRANT COUNTY DISTRICT CLERK'S OFFICE
ALL TRANSACTIONS FOR A CASE

Page: 4
Date: 10/31/2025
Time: 13:30

Cause Number: 322-744263-23 Date Filed: 12/18/2023
MORGAN MICHELLE MYERS v CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS
S

Cause of Action: DIVORCE WITH CHILDREN
Case Status.....: PENDING

Filemark	Description	Fee	Total
144	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #125	Y	5.00
145	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #124	Y	5.00
146	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #123	Y	5.00
147	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #122	Y	5.00
148	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #121	Y	5.00
149	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #120	Y	5.00
150	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #119	Y	5.00
151	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #118	Y	5.00
152	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #117	Y	5.00
153	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #116	Y	5.00
154	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #115	Y	5.00
155	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #114	Y	5.00
156	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #113	Y	5.00
157	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #112	Y	5.00
158	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #111	Y	5.00
159	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #110	Y	5.00
160	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #109	Y	5.00
161	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #108	Y	5.00
162	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #107	Y	5.00
163	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #106	Y	5.00
164	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #105	Y	5.00
165	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #104	Y	5.00
166	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #103	Y	5.00
167	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #102	Y	5.00
168	04/15/2024 COPIES - ELECTRONIC (11 PAGES OR MORE)	N	5.20
169	04/15/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #168	Y	5.20
170	04/15/2024 OVERPAYMENT	Y	1.80
171	04/16/2024 Refund Request Form-Created on 04/16/2024	UI	0.00

172	04/17/2024 COPIES - ELECTRONIC (1-10 PAGES)	N	13.00
173	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #172	Y	13.00
174	04/17/2024 COPIES - ELECTRONIC (11 PAGES OR MORE)	N	6.10
175	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #174	Y	6.10
176	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
177	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
178	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
179	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
180	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
181	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
182	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
183	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
184	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
185	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
186	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
187	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
188	04/17/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
189	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #188	Y	5.00
190	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #187	Y	5.00
191	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #186	Y	5.00
192	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #185	Y	5.00
193	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #184	Y	5.00
194	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #183	Y	5.00
195	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #182	Y	5.00
196	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #181	Y	5.00
197	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #180	Y	5.00
198	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #179	Y	5.00
199	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #178	Y	5.00
200	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #177	Y	5.00

TARRANT COUNTY DISTRICT CLERK'S OFFICE
ALL TRANSACTIONS FOR A CASE

Page: 5
Date: 10/31/2025
Time: 13:30

Cause Number: 322-744263-23 Date Filed: 12/18/2023
MORGAN MICHELLE MYERS v CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS
S

Cause of Action: DIVORCE WITH CHILDREN
Case Status.....: PENDING

Filemark	Description	Fee Total
201	04/17/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #176	Y 5.00
202	04/17/2024 OVERPAYMENT	Y 0.90
203	04/17/2024 Refund Request Form-Created on 04/17/2024	UI 0.00
204	04/19/2024 Accounting notification from #203	0.00
205	04/23/2024 ADJ REF PID#100295890047 OVERPAYMENT	YA -0.90
206	04/24/2024 MOTION FOR PRETRIAL CONFERENCE	UI 0.00
207	04/24/2024 RESP OBJECTION TO MTN FOR PRETRIAL CONFERENCE	UI 0.00
208	04/25/2024 *CORRECTED CT APPEALS (ORIG PROC) PET/MAND DENIED	I 0.00

209	04/25/2024	*2ND COA ORD (ORIG PROC) MTN/REHEARING DENIED	I	0.00
210	04/30/2024	NOTICE OF COMPLETION - CHARLES MYERS	UI	0.00
211	05/02/2024	*2ND COA ORD (ORIG PROC) MTN/REHEARING DENIED	I	0.00
212	05/13/2024	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MAND FILED	I	0.00
213	05/29/2024	Accounting notification from #171		0.00
214	06/04/2024	ADJ REF PID#100295738677 OVERPAYMENT	YA	-1.80
215	06/24/2024	MOTION FOR JOINDER OF PERSON NEED FOR JUST ADJ	UI	0.00
216	06/28/2024	IV-D INTERVENTION	NUI	80.00
217	07/01/2024	OBJ TO TITLE IV INTERVENTION	UI	0.00
218	07/05/2024	SECOND AMENDED COUNTERPETITION FOR DIVORCE	UI	0.00
219	08/23/2024	AG PAYMENT, for transaction 216, dated 06/28/2024	Y	52.80
220	08/30/2024	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MAND DENIED	I	0.00
221	09/10/2024	*POST CARD (SUP CT) REHEARING PET/MAND FILED	I	0.00
222	09/20/2024	RESP'S RULE 12 MOTION TO SHOW AUTHORITY	UI	0.00
223	09/20/2024	(PROP)ORD ON MTN FOR RULE 12 SHOW AUTHORITY	UI	0.00
224	09/26/2024	MOTION FOR TEMPORARY ORDERS	UI	0.00
225	09/26/2024	(PROPOSED) ORD ON MOT FOR TEMP ORDS	UI	0.00
226	09/27/2024	1ST AMENDED MOT FOR TEMP ORDS	UI	0.00
227	10/07/2024	JOINT MOTION TO RECUSE	UI	0.00
228	10/09/2024	ORDER OF REFERRAL SIGNED 10/8/24	UIM	0.00
229	10/09/2024	JUDGE'S RULING LETTER SIGNED 10/8/24	UIM	0.00
230	10/09/2024	NOTICE	UI	0.00
231	10/10/2024	OBJECTION	UI	0.00
232	10/10/2024	AMENDED JUDGE'S RULING LETTER SIGNED 10/9/24	UIM	0.00
233	10/10/2024	AMEND ORD OF REFERRAL SIGNED 10-9-24	UIM	0.00
234	10/11/2024	ORDER OF REFERRAL SIGNED 10/10/24	UIM	0.00
235	10/11/2024	COVER SHEET ORD OF REFERRAL	UIM	0.00
236	10/18/2024	*POST CARD (SUP CT) MTN/REHEARING DENIED	I	0.00
237	10/23/2024	ORD SET VIDEO CONF HEARING 10/30/24 @2:30PM	UIM	0.00
	10/23/2024	SIGNED 10/21/24		
238	10/23/2024	EMAIL NOTIFICATION	UI	0.00
239	10/29/2024	**COPY** ORD OF ASSIGN BY PRESIDING JUDGE W/ATTACH	UIM	0.00
	10/29/2024	SIGNED ON 10.28.24		
240	11/01/2024	ORDER OF ASSIGNMENT BY THE PRESIDING JUDGE	UIM	0.00
	11/01/2024	SIGNED 10-28-24		
241	11/04/2024	PRE TRIAL MOTION IN LIMINE	UI	0.00
242	11/04/2024	(PROPOSED) ORD ON MOT FOR PRETRIAL MOT IN LIMINE	UI	0.00
243	11/06/2024	REQ FOR CONFIRMATION OF PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS	UI	0.00
244	11/11/2024	EMAIL FROM COORDINATOR TO PARTIES	UI	0.00
245	11/11/2024	MOTION TO ENTER JUDGEMENT	UI	0.00
246	11/11/2024	(PROPOSED) ORDER ON MOTION TO ENTER JUDGEMENT	UI	0.00
247	11/11/2024	JOINT MOTION TO RECUSE	UI	0.00
248	11/13/2024	NOTICE OF INTENT TO REMOVE	UI	0.00
249	11/15/2024	MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY	UI	0.00
250	11/15/2024	(PROPOSED) ORD ON MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY	UI	0.00
251	11/19/2024	ORD DENY JOINT MTN TO RECUSE JUDGE MUNFORD &	UIM	0.00
	11/19/2024	JUDGE KAITCER SIGNED 11/7/24		
252	11/19/2024	COPIES - ELECTRONIC (1-10 PAGES)	N	5.00
253	11/19/2024	PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #252	Y	5.00

TARRANT COUNTY DISTRICT CLERK'S OFFICE
ALL TRANSACTIONS FOR A CASE

Page: 6
Date: 10/31/2025
Time: 13:30

Cause Number: 322-744263-23 Date Filed: 12/18/2023
MORGAN MICHELLE MYERS v CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS
S

Cause of Action: DIVORCE WITH CHILDREN
Case Status.....: PENDING

Filemark	Description	Fee	Total
254	11/19/2024 COPIES - ELECTRONIC (11 PAGES OR MORE)	N	31.70
255	11/19/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #254	Y	31.70
256	11/19/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
257	11/19/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
258	11/19/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
259	11/19/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
260	11/19/2024 CERTIFY AND SEAL COPY FEE	N	5.00
261	11/19/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #260	Y	5.00
262	11/19/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #259	Y	5.00
263	11/19/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #258	Y	5.00
264	11/19/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #257	Y	5.00
265	11/19/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #256	Y	5.00
266	11/21/2024 COPIES - ELECTRONIC (1-10 PAGES)	N	4.00
267	11/21/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #266	Y	4.00
268	11/21/2024 COPIES - ELECTRONIC (11 PAGES OR MORE)	N	0.20
269	11/21/2024 PAYMENT RECEIVED trans #268	Y	0.20
270	12/02/2024 NOTICE OF REMOVAL	UI	0.00
271	12/31/2024 NOTICE OF RELATED CASE	UI	0.00
272	01/08/2025 CERT CPY OF ORDER OF REMAND FRM US DIST CRT NORTHN	UI	0.00
	01/08/2025 DIST OF TX FTW DIV		
273	01/13/2025 CASE MEMO/PLEA FOR JUD REVIEW	UI	0.00
274	01/22/2025 NOTICE	UI	0.00
275	01/24/2025 MOT TO DISMISS FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION	UI	0.00
276	02/10/2025 EMER EXPAR JNT MTN FOR CHLD CUST, SOLE USE OF THE	UI	0.00
	02/10/2025 MATRIMONIAL RES, TRO, SANCTIONS, CONTEMPT AND NOT		
	02/10/2025 OF PAST DUE FINDINGS		
	02/10/2025 OF FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		
277	02/20/2025 MOTION TO SIGN	UI	0.00
278	02/20/2025 (PROPOSED) ORD ON MOT FOR SIGN ON UNOPPOSED MOT	UI	0.00
279	02/24/2025 OBJECTION & REQ FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE	UI	0.00
280	02/28/2025 REQUEST FOR RULING	UI	0.00
281	03/05/2025 NOTICE	UI	0.00
282	03/06/2025 UN-OPPOSED MTN TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION	UI	0.00
283	03/06/2025 (PROP) ORD ON MTN FOR UNOPPOSD MTN TO DIS FOR LACK	UI	0.00
	03/06/2025 OF JURISDICTION		
284	03/11/2025 NOTICE OF CONTINUED OBSTRUCTION	UI	0.00
285	03/12/2025 REQ TO SET UNOPPSD SUMMRY JDGMNT/UNOPPSD RULE 12	UI	0.00
	03/12/2025 MTNS FOR SUBMISSION		

286	03/14/2025	NOT OF UNOPPSD MTN TO DISMISS FOR WNT OF PRSCTN	UI	0.00
287	03/14/2025	(PROPOSED) ORDER ON UNOPPSD MTN TO DISMISS (TO LB)	UI	0.00
288	03/14/2025	NOTICE OF SUBMISSION	UI	0.00
299	03/18/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** PETITION IN SAPCR	UI	0.00
300	03/18/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** (ATTACHED) COVER LETTER	UI	0.00
301	03/18/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** AUSTIN FORM-VS165		0.00
302	03/18/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** MOTION FOR EMERGENCY TE	UI	0.00
	03/18/2025	MP INJUNCTIVE RELIEF		
303	03/18/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** MOTION FOR EMERGENCY TE	UI	0.00
	03/18/2025	MP INJUNCTIVE RELIEF		
304	03/18/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** STATEMENT OF INABILITY	UI	0.00
	03/18/2025	TO AFFORD PYMT OF CRT COSTS		
305	03/20/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** RESPONDENTS ORIGINAL AN	UI	0.00
	03/20/2025	SWER		
306	03/20/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE	UI	0.00
307	03/20/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** (PROPOSED)ORDER ON MOTI	UI	0.00
	03/20/2025	ON TO CONSOLIDATE		
308	03/20/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** REQUEST TO AMEND CASE C	UI	0.00
	03/20/2025	APTION		

TARRANT COUNTY DISTRICT CLERK'S OFFICE
ALL TRANSACTIONS FOR A CASE

Page: 7
Date: 10/31/2025
Time: 13:30

Cause Number: 322-744263-23 Date Filed: 12/18/2023
MORGAN MICHELLE MYERS v CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS
S
Cause of Action: DIVORCE WITH CHILDREN
Case Status.....: PENDING

	Filemark	Description		Fee Total
309	03/20/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** MTN TO STRIKE RESP ANSW	UI	0.00
	03/20/2025	ER & MTN TO CONSOL		
310	03/20/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** EMERGENCY EXPARTE MTN T	UI	0.00
	03/20/2025	O DECLARE JDGMNT VOID AB		
	03/20/2025	INTITIO & FOR IMMEDIATE RE-ENTRY		
311	03/21/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** MOTION FOR RULE 12 SHOW	UI	0.00
	03/21/2025	AUTHORITY		
312	03/21/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** (PROP)ORD ON MTN TO SHO	UI	0.00
	03/21/2025	W AUTHORITY		
313	03/24/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** PETITIONERS OBJECTION T	UI	0.00
	03/24/2025	O CONSOLIDATION		
314	03/24/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** (PROP)TRO & ORD SET HRG	UI	0.00
315	03/24/2025	*** From 233-765358-25 *** EMERGENCY MOTION FOR TR	UI	0.00
	03/24/2025	O		
289	03/27/2025	ORDER TERMINATING ASSIGNMENT	UIM	0.00
290	04/01/2025	RESP'S STATEMENT	UI	0.00
291	04/01/2025	RESP'S PRE-OBJECTN TO CONSOLIDATION	UI	0.00
292	04/01/2025	(PROP) ORDER ON MTN FOR CONSOL	UI	0.00

316	04/01/2025 *** From 233-765358-25 *** PTNR'S STATEMENT - REQU	UI	0.00
	04/01/2025 EST DECLARATORY JUDGMENT		
317	04/02/2025 *** From 233-765358-25 *** PETITIONER'S NOTICE	UI	0.00
293	04/03/2025 MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE	UI	0.00
294	04/04/2025 EMERG NTC OF IMPROPER EX-PARTE APPEARANCE	UI	0.00
295	04/04/2025 RESP'S COMPREHENSIVE LEGAL ANALYSIS IN FAV OF DISM	UI	0.00
296	04/04/2025 RESP'S NTC OF NEW INFORMATION	UI	0.00
318	04/04/2025 *** From 233-765358-25 *** PTNR'S PRE-OBJECTION TO	UI	0.00
	04/04/2025 MOTION TO TRANSFER		
297	04/07/2025 RESP'S NOT OF INTENT TO SEEK AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT	UI	0.00
	04/07/2025 OF PROHIBITION		
319	04/07/2025 *** From 233-765358-25 *** PTNR NOT OF INTENT TO F	UI	0.00
	04/07/2025 ILE MANDAMUS/EMERGENCY STAY		
298	04/10/2025 ORD ON MTN TO CONSOL	UIM	0.00
320	04/10/2025 *** From 233-765358-25 *** ORD ON MTN TO CONSOL	UIM	0.00
321	04/10/2025 *** From 233-765358-25 *** SEE TRN #22/ORD ON MTN		0.00
	04/10/2025 TO CONSOL		
322	04/10/2025 *CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) PET/MAND FILED	UI	0.00
	04/10/2025 -25)		
323	04/11/2025 *MEMO OPIN (ORIG PROC) PET/MAND DENIED	UI	0.00
324	04/14/2025 *CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) PET/MAND FILED	I	0.00
325	04/15/2025 PROCEDURAL IRREGULARITIES IN TEMP ORDS ANALYSIS	UI	0.00
326	04/15/2025 DOMINANT JURISDICTION ANALYSIS	UI	0.00
327	04/15/2025 LTR REQ'G SAPCR TO BE FILED UNDER SEPARATE CASE	UI	0.00
328	04/15/2025 *CT/APPEALS (ORIG/PROC) PET/MAND & MTN/STAY DENIED	I	0.00
329	04/16/2025 *CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) PET/MAND FILED	I	0.00
330	04/17/2025 *CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) PET/MAND DENIED	I	0.00
333	04/22/2025 EMERGENCY EX-PARTE APPLICATION FOR TRO	UI	0.00
331	04/23/2025 NOCP 4/29/25 @ 9:00AM	UIM	0.00
332	04/23/2025 OBJECTION TO TRIAL SETTING AND REQ FOR STAY OF	UI	0.00
	04/23/2025 PROCEEDINGS		
334	04/24/2025 PLEA TO THE JURISDICTION (PROP ORD ATTCHD)	UI	0.00
335	04/24/2025 (PROP) ORDR ON PLEA TO THE JURISDICTION (ATCHD TO	I	0.00
	04/24/2025 THE MTN ON PLEA TO THE JURISDICTION)		
336	04/24/2025 *CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) MTN/RECONSIDER DENIED	I	0.00
337	04/25/2025 MOTION TO RECUSE (TO TK)	UI	0.00
338	04/25/2025 EMERGENCY NOTICE TO THE COURT	UI	0.00
339	04/25/2025 FIRST AMEND EMERG NOT TO THE COURT	UI	0.00
340	04/28/2025 NOT OF NON APPEARANCE AND OBJ TO FINAL TRIAL SETT	UI	0.00
	04/28/2025 (TO TK)		
341	04/28/2025 1ST AMENDED MTN TO RECUSE (TO TK)	UI	0.00
342	04/28/2025 TABLE OF CONTENTS ATTACHED TO THE 1ST AMEND MTN	UI	0.00
	04/28/2025 RECUSE		
343	04/29/2025 JUDGES LTTR REG RECUSAL DATED 4/29/2025	UIM	0.00
344	04/29/2025 ORD OF REFRL ON MTN TO RECUSE/1ST AMD MTN RECUSE	UIM	0.00
	04/29/2025 TO RECUSE		
345	04/29/2025 JUDGES LTTR REGARDING RECUSAL DATED 4/29/2025	UIM	0.00
346	04/29/2025 ORD OF REFRL ON MTN TO RECUSE/1ST AMD MTN RECUSE	UIM	0.00
347	04/29/2025 OBJECTION - RECUSAL PROCEDURE (TO TK/JDG EVANS/LB)	UI	0.00
348	05/01/2025 *POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MAND FILED	I	0.00

352	05/01/2025	*CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) MTN RECONSIDERATION DENIED	I	0.00
353	05/01/2025	*CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) MTN RECONSIDERATION DENIED	I	0.00
349	05/05/2025	MTN TO DISQUALIFY COUNSEL	UI	0.00
351	05/06/2025	OBJ TO ORDER OF ASSGNMENT DATED 5-6-25	UI	0.00
	05/06/2025	(TO TK FOR JUDGE EVANS)		
350	05/07/2025	ORDER OF ASSIGNMENT BY THE PRESIDING JUDGE	UIM	0.00
354	05/07/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MAND FILED	I	0.00
355	05/19/2025	ORD DENYING OBJ TO ORD OF ASSIGNMENT DATED 05-6-25	UIM	0.00
	05/19/2025	& THE OBJ DATED 04-29-25 SIGNED 05-15-25		
356	05/19/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MAND FILED	I	0.00
357	05/20/2025	ORDER SUMMARILY DENYING MOTION FOR RECUSAL	UIM	0.00
	05/20/2025	SIGNED 05-19-25		
358	05/20/2025	ORDER SUMMARILY DENYING MOTION FOR RECUSAL	UIM	0.00
	05/20/2025	SIGNED 5-19-25		
359	05/21/2025	NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE MANDAMUS (TO T KEMP FOR	UI	0.00
	05/21/2025	JUDGE EVANS AND JUDGE CAYCE)		
360	05/22/2025	MTN TO STRIKE THE INTERVENTION OF THE OFFICE OF	UI	0.00
	05/22/2025	THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (TO T KEMP FOR JDG EVANS AND		
	05/22/2025	JUSTICE CAYCE)		
361	05/22/2025	(PROP) ORDER ON MTN TO STRIKE INTERVENTION OF THE	UI	0.00
	05/22/2025	OAG (TO T KEMP FOR JDGE EVANS AND JUSTICE CAYCE)		
362	05/27/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MAND FILED	I	0.00
363	06/04/2025	1ST AMEND PLEA TO THE JURISDICTION	UI	0.00
	06/04/2025	6-5-25 TO T KEMP FOR JDGE EVANS AND JUSTICE CAYCE		
364	06/05/2025	NOTICE OF RELATED CASE (CIV-24-1311-R WEST DIST	UI	0.00
	06/05/2025	OF OKLAHOMA)		
365	06/10/2025	RESP'S NOT OF RELATED FEDERAL RICO LIT (OK CASE)	UI	0.00
366	06/24/2025	NOT REGARDING RICO LIT (OKLAHOMA CASE)	UI	0.00
367	07/11/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MANDAMUS DENIED; MTN FOR	I	0.00
	07/11/2025	TEMP RELIEF DISM AS MOOT; MTN/CONSOLIDATE DENIED A		
	07/11/2025	S AMENDED		
368	07/11/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MANDAMUS DENIED; MTN/CONS	I	0.00
	07/11/2025	DENIED AS AMENDED		
369	07/11/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MANDAMUS DENIED; MTN/CONS	I	0.00
	07/11/2025	DENIED AS AMENDED		
370	07/11/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MANDAMUS DENIED; EMERGENCY	I	0.00
	07/11/2025	MTN/STAY DISM AS MOOT; MTN/CONSOLIDATE DENIED AS A		
	07/11/2025	MENDED		
371	07/11/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) MTN/REHEARING FILED	I	0.00
372	07/11/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) MTN/REHEARING FILED	I	0.00
373	07/11/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) MTN/REHEARING FILED	I	0.00
374	07/11/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) MTN/REHEARING FILED	I	0.00
375	07/11/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MAND DENIED, MTN/STAY DISM	I	0.00
	07/11/2025	& MTN/CONSOLIDATE DENIED		
376	07/28/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) MTN/REHEARING FILED	I	0.00
377	07/28/2025	NOTICE: RICO UPDATE	UI	0.00
378	08/15/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) MTN/REHEARING DENIED	I	0.00
379	08/15/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) MTN/REHEARING DENIED	I	0.00
380	08/15/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) MTN/REHEARING DENIED	I	0.00
381	08/18/2025	NOT COURT PROC & DOC CTRL 12/10/25 @9AM (8/15/25)	UIM	0.00

382	08/20/2025	OBJ TO NOTICE SETTING A CRT PROCEEDING AND DKT	UI	0.00
	08/20/2025	CONTROL ORDER		
383	08/20/2025	REQUEST FOR OATH OF OFFICE RECORDS	UI	0.00
384	08/27/2025	NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE TERTIARY RECUSAL (TO TK)	UI	0.00
385	08/29/2025	OBJECTION TO ORDER ORDER OF REFERRAL	UI	0.00
386	08/29/2025	NOTICE OF INTENT TO COMMENCE FEDERAL ACTION	UI	0.00
387	08/29/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MAND DENIED	I	0.00
388	09/02/2025	ORDER OF REFERRAL TO JDG EVANS	UIM	0.00
389	09/02/2025	LTR FRM JUDGE MUNFORD TO JUDGE EVANS RE NOTICE OF	UIM	0.00
	09/02/2025	INTENT TO FILE TERTIARY RECUSAL		
390	09/03/2025	1ST AMENDED REQ FOR EMERGENCY STAY AND INJ RELIEF	UI	0.00
391	09/03/2025	(PROP) ORDER ON REQ FOR EMERGENCY STAY AND INJ REL	UI	0.00
392	09/05/2025	MOTION TO RECUSE	UI	0.00
393	09/05/2025	(PROP) ORDER ON MOTION TO RECUSE	UI	0.00
394	09/08/2025	NOTICE TO THE HONORABLE DAVID L.EVANS	UI	0.00
395	09/11/2025	ORDER OF REERRAL (SGND 09/09/25)	UIM	0.00
396	09/11/2025	LETTER RULING (SGND 09/09/25)	UIM	0.00
397	09/11/2025	ORDER OF REFERRAL (SGND 09/09/25)	UIM	0.00
398	09/11/2025	LETTER RULING (SGND 09/09/25)	UIM	0.00
399	09/11/2025	NOTICE	UI	0.00
400	09/11/2025	MOTION TO RECUSE THE REGIONAL PRESIDING JUDGE	UI	0.00
401	09/11/2025	(PROP)ORDER ON MOTION TO RECUSE THE REGIONAL	UI	0.00
	09/11/2025	PRESIDING JUDGE		
402	09/11/2025	1ST AMENDED MOT TO RECUSE THE REGIONAL PRESIDING	UI	0.00
	09/11/2025	JUDGE		
403	09/11/2025	(PROPOSED)ORD ON MOT FOR MOT TO RECUSE THE	UI	0.00
	09/11/2025	REGIONAL PRESIDING JUDGE		
404	09/16/2025	OBJECTION TO LOCAL RULE 1.06B2 AND FOR JUDIC NOTIC	UI	0.00
	09/16/2025	OF FEDERAL ACTION		
405	09/22/2025	NOTICE	UI	0.00
410	09/25/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) PET/MANDAMUS FILED	I	0.00
406	09/26/2025	ORDR OF REFERRAL DENIES MTN TO RECUSE THE REGIONAL	UI	0.00
	09/26/2025	PRESING JUDGE EVANS		
407	09/26/2025	ORDER SUMMARILLY DENYING MTN TO RECUSE J MUNFORD	UIM	0.00
408	09/26/2025	ORDER SUMMARILLY DENYING MTN TO RECUSE J KAITCER	UIM	0.00
409	09/26/2025	ORDR OF REFERRAL DENIES FIRST AMENDED MTN TO RECUS	UIM	0.00
	09/26/2025	E REGIONAL PRESIDING JUDGE EVANS		
411	10/02/2025	MOT FOR SANCTIONS & REQUEST FOR ATTY'S FEES	UI	0.00
412	10/07/2025	JOINT MTN TO VACATE ORDER SUMMARILY DENYING MTN TO	UI	0.00
	10/07/2025	RECUSE/ORDER DIRECTING THE CASE TO PROCEED TO TRIA		
	10/07/2025	L PURSUANT TO TEX		
	10/07/2025	CIV PRAC & REM CODE 30.016/ORDER REMANDATORY SANCT		
	10/07/2025	IONS FOR THE FILING		
	10/07/2025	OF TERTIARY RECUSAL MOTION/STRIKE PETITIONER'S MOT		
	10/07/2025	ION FOR SANCTIONS		
	10/07/2025	AND REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES		
413	10/10/2025	*POST CARD (SUP/CT) MTN/DISM GRANTED	I	0.00
414	10/10/2025	RESP'S RESP IN OPPOSITION TO PTNR'S MTN FOR SANCTI	UI	0.00
	10/10/2025	ONS AND REQ FOR ATTNY'S FEES (TO TK)		
415	10/14/2025	ORDER DECLARING NTC OF INTENT TO FILE TERTIARY MOT	UIM	0.00

	10/14/2025	OF RECUSAL MOOT		
416	10/15/2025	EMAILED TRANS # 415	I	0.00
417	10/15/2025	INVENTORY AND APPRAISAL STATEMENT	UI	0.00
418	10/17/2025	RESP'S JOINT MTN TO SET ASIDE A VOID ORDER AND FOR	UI	0.00
	10/17/2025	CONTEMPT OF COURT AND TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO TEX P		
	10/17/2025	RAC REM CODE 13.001		
419	10/17/2025	(PROP) ORDR ON RESP'S JOINT MTN TO SET ASIDE A VOI	UI	0.00
	10/17/2025	D ORDER (TRN 418) (TO TK)		
420	10/23/2025	NOTICE OF JURISDICTIONAL DEFECT	UI	0.00
421	10/30/2025	*CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) PET/MANDAMUS FILED	I	0.00
422	10/31/2025	*CT/APPEALS (ORIG PROC) PET/MANDAMUS DENIED	I	0.00

Total Number Of Records Printed: 422

Automated Certificate of eService

This automated certificate of service was created by the eFiling system. The filer served this document via email generated by the eFiling system on the date and to the persons listed below. The rules governing certificates of service have not changed. Filers must still provide a certificate of service that complies with all applicable rules.

Envelope ID: 108494358

Filing Code Description: Answer/Contest/Response/Waiver

Filing Description: Response in Support of Granting No-Evidence

Summary Judgment on Submission

Status as of 12/1/2025 12:34 PM CST

Case Contacts

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
CHARLES MYERS		chuckdustin12@gmail.com	11/26/2025 10:49:35 AM	SENT
Cooper L.Carter		coopercarter@majadmin.com	11/26/2025 10:49:35 AM	SENT
HOLLY HAYES		csd-legal-914@texasattorneygeneral.gov	11/26/2025 10:49:35 AM	SENT
MORGAN MICHELLEMYERS		MORGANMW02@GMAIL.COM	11/26/2025 10:49:35 AM	SENT