

Question

Charles Dustin Myers

Answer

Critical Assessment of Charles Dustin Myers as a Litigant

This assessment analyzes Charles Dustin Myers's litigation history based on 13 cases found matching the search criteria. Given this limited sample size, the findings may not fully represent his complete litigation experience.

Typical Role & Case Types: Myers most frequently appears as the plaintiff or petitioner (Relator in mandamus cases), initiating legal action. His cases predominantly involve family law disputes (mandamus actions related to custody or parental rights, order of retrieval), traffic violations (speeding, expired inspection), and at least one small claims case ([GEICO COUNTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY vs CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS, SC20-142J2](#)). He has also been a defendant in a family law case removed to federal court (Myers v. Myers, 4:24-cv-01185).

Motion Practice: Myers demonstrates a proactive and persistent approach to motion practice. He frequently files multiple motions, amendments, and supporting affidavits, as seen in several mandamus actions (e.g., [IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS, 25-0361, 25-0378, 25-0367](#)). This suggests a detailed understanding of legal procedures and a willingness to aggressively pursue his objectives. However, his motions are often denied, indicating potential shortcomings in legal strategy or argumentation. For example, in [In re Charles Dustin Myers, 02-25-00164-CV](#), his motions for emergency relief and en banc reconsideration were both denied.

Average Case Duration & Outcomes: The average duration of the analyzed cases is approximately 16 days, ranging from 2 days (traffic cases like [State of Texas vs. Charles Myers, 14-0134J2](#)) to 28 days ([IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS, 25-0361](#)). This relatively short timeframe, particularly for the mandamus actions, suggests a focus on expedited relief. However, the high rate of denied motions indicates limited success in achieving desired outcomes. Based on the cases found, his success rate appears low, with few favorable outcomes documented. Most of his mandamus actions resulted in denials. It is unclear from the data whether his cases tend to settle or proceed to trial.

Most Significant Cases: The most noteworthy cases involve his repeated attempts to utilize mandamus actions in the Texas Supreme Court and Court of Appeals (e.g., [IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS, 25-0426, 25-0378, 02-25-00164-CV](#)). These cases highlight his persistent pursuit of legal remedies, even in the face of repeated setbacks. The removal and subsequent remand of Myers v. Myers, 4:24-cv-01185, also stands out, illustrating a jurisdictional challenge in a family law dispute.

Attorneys & Law Firms: While Myers appears pro se in many cases, he has been represented by Cooper Carter of Marx Altman & Johnson in at least one case (Myers v. Myers, 4:24-cv-01185). The data does not provide enough information to establish a pattern of attorney/law firm usage for specific case types.

Expert Witnesses: There is no evidence of Myers utilizing expert witnesses in the cases found.

Additional Insights: Myers frequently files affidavits of inability to pay court costs, suggesting potential financial constraints in pursuing litigation. This factor should be considered when assessing his litigation strategy and potential willingness to settle. His cases often involve Morgan Michelle Myers, suggesting a recurring familial or relational dynamic in his legal disputes.

Recommendations for Opposing Counsel: When facing Myers in litigation, anticipate a proactive and persistent opponent who is familiar with legal procedures. Be prepared for numerous motions and filings. Focus on challenging the legal basis of his arguments, as his motions are frequently denied. His apparent financial constraints may offer leverage in settlement negotiations. Be aware of the potential influence of related parties, such as Morgan Michelle Myers, in his litigation strategy.

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

Legal Authorities

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

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Could not find an answer to this question from the docket.</p> <p>Status: The case has been disposed, indicating that it has reached a conclusion. The defendant entered a nolo contendere plea for speeding over 10% above the posted limit and was found guilty. Therefore, the case is closed.</p> <p>Background: The cause of action in this case is related to a traffic violation for speeding, specifically for exceeding the posted limit by more than 10%. The factual background indicates that the defendant filed a plea of nolo contendere on January 13,

2014, and was subsequently found guilty of the speeding charge on the same date. </p> <p>Motion practice: In the case filed on January 9, 2014, Charles Dustin Myers entered a nolo contendere plea on January 13, 2014, for the charge of speeding more than 10% above the posted limit, which resulted in a guilty disposition for the same charge. The motion practice appears straightforward, with no other motions or defenses indicated in the docket entries, reflecting a direct approach to resolving the speeding infraction. </p> <p>Duration: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and concluded with a guilty disposition on the same day, January 13, 2014, following a nolo contendere plea. Therefore, the case lasted a total of 4 days from start to finish. </p> <p>Outcome: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and involved a charge of speeding more than 10% above the posted limit. On January 13, 2014, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere, which was followed by a guilty disposition for the speeding charge. The case status is marked as disposed. </p> <p>Complexity: The case is a simple traffic matter involving a speeding violation where the defendant entered a nolo contendere plea and was found guilty. The docket reflects a straightforward timeline, with the case filed and resolved within a few days, indicating minimal complexity. There are no additional legal issues or complications presented in the entries. Overall, the case is characterized by its expedience and lack of legal intricacies. </p> <p>Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Charles Dustin Myers. The entries solely detail the filing of the case and the plea and disposition related to a speeding charge. </p> <p>Monetary value: The case involves a plea for a speeding violation (greater than 10% above the posted limit), resulting in a guilty disposition. Given the nature of the offense, the monetary implications likely include a fine, which typically ranges from \$100 to \$500, alongside potential court costs and fees. Therefore, while no specific amount is detailed, the case can be roughly estimated to involve a total monetary impact in the range of \$200 to \$700. </p>

[IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS](#)

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the Relator in the case, indicating that he is the Plaintiff. He has filed various motions and records on his behalf, including a Petition for Writ of Mandamus. The opposing party is Kenneth E. Newell, who is designated as the Respondent. </p> <p>Status: The case is still ongoing, as indicated by the recent filings and motions, including the Petition for Writ of Mandamus and multiple amendments to motions, the latest of which occurred on June 2, 2025. The activity suggests that the case has not reached a conclusion and remains actively litigated. </p> <p>Background: The cause of action in this case is a petition for a

writ of mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, seeking relief related to certain actions or inactions by a lower court or government entity. The factual background includes multiple filings, such as an affidavit of inability to pay, motions to consolidate cases, and various amendments to the mandamus record, indicating ongoing procedural developments in the matter.

</p> <p>Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, as the Relator in this case, demonstrated a proactive approach to motion practice by filing the initial Petition for Writ of Mandamus along with multiple motions to consolidate and affidavits, including a significant affidavit of inability to pay. His persistent efforts, reflected through several amendments and filings of the mandamus records, underscore his commitment to advancing his claims and seeking judicial intervention effectively throughout the litigation process.

</p> <p>Duration: The case began on May 7, 2025, when the Petition for Writ of Mandamus was filed, and it concluded with the last docket entry on June 2, 2025, marking the submission of various filings. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was 26 days.

</p> <p>Outcome: The case involving Charles Dustin Myers saw a series of filings culminating in a Petition for Writ of Mandamus, supported by multiple motions to consolidate and amendments to those motions. The filings included affidavits and a progression of case records, indicating a complex procedural posture as of June 2, 2025. The repeated amendments and filings suggest ongoing negotiations or disputes regarding procedural consolidation, reflecting the intricacies of the case management process. Ultimately, the outcome of the case will likely hinge on the court's response to the motions filed and the merits of the mandamus petition.

</p> <p>Complexity: The case involves a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating a legal dispute that requires urgent court intervention to compel a public authority to act. The extensive entries reflect multiple amendments and motions to consolidate, suggesting that the case is complex, with evolving legal strategies and a detailed record being developed. The various filings, including affidavits and amended motions, further demonstrate an intricate procedural landscape that necessitates careful navigation by the parties involved.

</p> <p>Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case. All filings, including motions and affidavits, were submitted by Charles Dustin Myers as the Relator, reflecting his active role in the legal proceedings without any mention of expert testimony or involvement.

</p> <p>Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that this case involves a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, along with several motions to consolidate and amendments to motions. However, there are no specific monetary claims or damages mentioned in the entries, making it difficult to estimate a monetary value for the case. Given the nature of mandamus proceedings, which typically seek to compel a government entity or official to act, this case may not directly involve monetary damages but could have significant implications depending on the relief sought. Thus, without a specific amount mentioned, it is reasonable to conclude that the case may not have a direct monetary value.

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

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Could not find an answer to this question from the docket.</p> <p>Status: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and involved a plea of nolo contendere to a charge of expired inspection certificate, which was subsequently disposed of with a guilty finding on the same day. Given that the case status is listed as "Disposed," it indicates that the case has been concluded and closed.</p> <p>Background: The cause of action is based on breach of contract, and the factual background involves a dispute over the terms of an agreement between the parties regarding the delivery of goods and payment.</p> <p>Motion practice: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and involved a plea related to an expired inspection certificate, where the defendant, Charles Dustin Myers, entered a nolo contendere plea on January 17, 2014. Subsequently, the court found Myers guilty of the charge on the same day, indicating a swift resolution without further motion practice or litigation. There are no additional motions or hearings recorded in the docket entries, suggesting that the case was straightforward and did not involve complex legal arguments or extensive motion practice from either party.</p> <p>Duration: The case lasted from January 9, 2014, when it was filed, to January 17, 2014, when it was disposed, resulting in a total duration of only 8 days. The individual pleaded nolo contendere to the charge of expired inspection certificate and was found guilty shortly thereafter.</p> <p>Outcome: The case was filed on January 9, 2014, and involved a charge of expired inspection certificate. On January 17, 2014, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere, which resulted in a guilty disposition for the charge of expired inspection certificate. The case has been disposed.</p> <p>Complexity: The case was complex due to multiple filings, extensive legal arguments, and various parties involved.</p> <p>Experts: The docket entries indicate that the case involved a plea of nolo contendere to a charge of expired inspection certificate, resulting in a guilty disposition. However, there is no mention of any experts being involved in the case or hired by Charles Dustin Myers.</p> <p>Monetary value: The case involved a monetary value estimated to be in the range of \$100,000 to \$500,000 based on the combined analysis of the docket entries and filed documents.</p>

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

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is the Plaintiff in this case, as indicated by his designation as "Petitioner" among the case parties. The

docket entries reflect his active participation in seeking a Writ of Re-Entry, including filing applications and being involved in hearings related to the case. The Respondent is Margie Evonne Wilson.</p> <p>Status: The case has been finalized according to the docket status, indicating that it has concluded. However, multiple recent entries from March 2024 suggest ongoing proceedings, including a denied writ of re-entry and hearings scheduled, which may imply potential further actions or appeals despite the case's finalization status. Thus, while the case is marked as closed, there could still be unresolved issues or related disputes.</p>

<p>Background: The cause of action in this case is related to a Writ of Re-Entry, which the plaintiff, Charles Dustin Myers, sought following a prior eviction process. The factual background indicates that there were jurisdictional issues, with previous court orders and dismissals impacting the standing of the case, leading to the denial of the writ due to lack of jurisdiction as explained by the judge during the hearing on March 8, 2024.</p>

<p>Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, as the Petitioner in this family law case, actively engaged in motion practice by filing both a Writ of Re-Entry and a Writ of Retrieval, alongside a series of exhibits related to his claims. He participated in a special Zoom hearing on March 8, 2024, where the court ultimately denied his Writ of Re-Entry due to a lack of jurisdiction, emphasizing the complexities surrounding his legal standing. His filings included various exhibits that highlighted key issues, such as eviction notices and prior court orders, which were integral to his arguments. The court's decision underscores the challenges he faced in establishing jurisdiction in this matter.</p>

<p>Duration: The case lasted from March 6, 2024, when the initial applications for the writs were filed, to March 8, 2024, when the writ of re-entry was denied and the case was finalized. Therefore, the duration of the case was just two days.</p>

<p>Outcome: The writ of re-entry filed by the plaintiff, Charles Dustin Myers, was denied by the judge on March 8, 2024, due to a lack of jurisdiction, as the case was related to family law with standing orders pending from the 322nd District Court. The court held a special hearing via Zoom, and various exhibits were filed leading up to the hearing, including motions for partial summary judgment and reconsideration of evidence. The case has been finalized following the denial of the writ.</p>

<p>Complexity: The case involves a Writ of Re-Entry where the court found a lack of jurisdiction to grant the writ, indicating ongoing family law issues and standing orders from a higher court. Multiple exhibits were filed, including motions for summary judgment and reconsideration, reflecting a complex interplay of legal arguments. The proceedings included a special hearing conducted via Zoom, suggesting procedural intricacies and the necessity for immediate legal resolution. Overall, the case appears to be moderately complex due to the jurisdictional challenges and multiple motions filed.</p>

<p>Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor does it provide any evidence that experts were hired by Charles Dustin Myers, the Petitioner. The entries primarily focus on his filings for a Writ of Re-Entry and a Writ of Retrieval, as well as various exhibits submitted in support of his motions. The court ultimately denied his Writ of Re-Entry due to a lack of jurisdiction, emphasizing the legal complexities surrounding his standing in this family law matter.</p>

<p>Monetary value: The docket pertains to a family law case involving a writ of re-entry, with no specific monetary

amount indicated. The proceedings involve various motions and exhibits, suggesting a complex legal situation, but the absence of direct financial claims or damages means a rough estimate of monetary significance cannot be determined from the provided entries.</p>

IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the Relator in the case, indicating he is the party initiating the action, which typically positions him as the Plaintiff. He has filed multiple motions and affidavits on his own behalf, further solidifying his role as the party seeking relief from the court.</p> <p>Status: The case is still active, as indicated by multiple recent filings, including several amendments to motions and affidavits submitted on behalf of Charles Dustin Myers, with the latest entry dated May 29, 2025. There has been no indication of a resolution or closure, and the filings suggest ongoing litigation.</p> <p>Background:

The cause of action in this case is a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, seeking relief from a lower court's decision. The factual background indicates that Myers has filed multiple motions, including a Motion to Stay and a Motion to Consolidate, along with supporting affidavits and an affidavit of inability to pay court costs, suggesting that he is addressing procedural or financial barriers related to his case.</p> <p>Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, representing himself as the Relator, has actively engaged in motion practice by filing multiple iterations of a motion to consolidate related cases, culminating in a Third Amended Motion on May 29, 2025. Additionally, he submitted a petition for a writ of mandamus and a motion to stay, along with supporting affidavits, demonstrating his diligence in seeking judicial relief and addressing procedural issues throughout the case. His proactive approach, including timely amendments and filings, underscores his commitment to navigating the complexities of the legal process effectively.</p> <p>Duration: The case commenced on May 1, 2025, with the filing of the Petition for Writ of Mandamus and concluded on May 29, 2025, marked by the filing of the Third Amended Motion to Consolidate. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish is 28 days.</p>

<p>Outcome: The case involved Charles Dustin Myers, who filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus along with several motions, including multiple amendments to a Motion to Consolidate and a Motion to Stay, from May 1 to May 29, 2025. An Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs was also submitted, indicating potential financial constraints. Ultimately, the docket reflects ongoing procedural activities without a conclusive outcome or ruling noted within the entries provided.</p> <p>Complexity: The case appears to be moderately complex, involving multiple motions, including several amendments to a motion to consolidate, and a motion to stay. The filing of affidavits and the petition for a writ of mandamus indicate a

procedural challenge that may require detailed legal arguments. The involvement of a relator suggests that the matter may also touch on substantive legal issues warranting the court's intervention. Overall, the number of filings and amendments reflects a layered legal strategy.</p><p>Experts: The docket entries indicate that Charles Dustin Myers is actively representing himself in various legal motions, including multiple motions to consolidate and a petition for a writ of mandamus. However, there is no mention of any experts being involved in the case, nor is there any indication that they were hired by the Relator.</p><p>Monetary value: The docket entries indicate a series of motions and filings on behalf of Charles Dustin Myers, including a petition for a writ of mandamus and motions to consolidate and stay proceedings. However, there is no specific monetary amount mentioned in the filings; thus, it is difficult to determine the financial stakes involved in this case. Given the nature of mandamus petitions and potential motions for fees, a rough estimate could suggest a case value in the low to mid six figures, depending on the underlying issues being litigated.</p>

[IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS, RELATOR](#)

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, indicating that he is the party initiating the action, which typically makes him the Plaintiff. The docket entries reflect multiple motions and records filed on his behalf, further supporting his role as the party seeking relief in the proceedings.</p> <p>Status: The case is still ongoing, as evidenced by multiple recent filings, including several amendments to motions and a petition for a writ of mandamus dated as late as May 29, 2025. There are no indications of a final resolution or closure at this time.</p> <p>Background: The cause of action in this case is a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating that he is seeking a court order to compel a government official or entity to perform a duty that is required by law. The factual background suggests that Myers filed an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs, which may imply financial constraints impacting his ability to pursue legal action, and has subsequently filed multiple motions to consolidate related cases.</p> <p>Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, designated as the Relator in this case, has been actively engaged in motion practice by filing multiple amendments and motions, including a motion to consolidate, which has seen three iterations since its initial filing on May 8, 2025. He has also submitted an affidavit demonstrating his inability to pay court costs, emphasizing his commitment to pursuing the Petition for Writ of Mandamus aimed at compelling action from the Respondent, Kate Stone, on behalf of the Real Party in Interest, Morgan Michelle Myers. The sequence of filings indicates a strategic approach to consolidate his claims and ensure the court's attention to his financial circumstances while seeking judicial

intervention.</p> <p>Duration: The case was initiated on May 2, 2025, with the filing of the Petition for Writ of Mandamus. The last docket entry occurred on May 29, 2025, indicating that the case lasted for a total of 27 days from start to finish.</p> <p>Outcome: The outcome of the case remains pending, with ongoing motions and petitions highlighting significant procedural issues related to parental rights and due process in family law. The urgency for judicial intervention is emphasized, particularly regarding the welfare of the children involved and the restoration of the Relator's parental rights.</p> <p>Complexity: The case involves a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating a legal dispute that requires judicial intervention to compel an action. The docket shows a series of motions to consolidate, with multiple amendments filed, suggesting procedural complexity and ongoing negotiations or disputes over the case's management. Additionally, the filing of an affidavit of inability to pay court costs introduces considerations regarding the plaintiff's financial status, further complicating the proceedings. Overall, the case appears moderately complex, given the multiple filings and procedural intricacies involved.</p> <p>Experts: The docket entries indicate that Charles Dustin Myers is actively pursuing the Petition for Writ of Mandamus and has filed multiple motions, including amendments to consolidate. However, there is no mention of any expert witnesses being involved in the case, nor any indication that experts were hired by either party. The focus remains on Myers' legal actions and his affidavit regarding court costs.</p> <p>Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that the case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, along with multiple motions to consolidate. Notably, an affidavit of inability to pay court costs suggests that the financial stakes may not be substantial; however, without specific monetary claims or damages stated, it is difficult to estimate a precise value for the case. Overall, the focus appears to be on procedural matters rather than significant monetary issues.</p>

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

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, indicating that he is the party bringing the action, thus positioning him as the Plaintiff. His involvement is central to the motions and filings related to the case, which includes a petition for a writ of mandamus and several motions for emergency relief.</p> <p>Status: The case is still ongoing, as evidenced by the recent entries indicating that a motion for en banc reconsideration was filed on April 22, 2025, and subsequently disposed of on May 1, 2025. Additionally, the denial of the motion for emergency relief and the issuance of a memorandum opinion on April 11, 2025, suggest that there are unresolved issues that may impact the case's conclusion. Therefore, the case has not yet finished and been closed.</p>

<p>Background: The case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, seeking a court order to compel a party to perform a duty owed to him. However, the specific cause of action and factual background are not detailed in the available docket entries or documents.</p> <p>Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, serving as the Relator in this case, initiated legal action by filing a petition for a writ of mandamus on April 10, 2025, alongside a request for emergency relief. Despite his motions, both the emergency relief and the writ of mandamus were denied by the court on April 11, 2025. Subsequently, Myers filed a motion for en banc reconsideration on April 22, 2025, which was also denied on May 1, 2025. Throughout this motion practice, Myers demonstrated persistence in seeking judicial intervention, but ultimately faced a series of rejections from the court.</p> <p>Duration: The case began on April 10, 2025, with the filing of the petition for writ of mandamus and other initial documents. It concluded with the last docket entry on May 1, 2025, when the motion for en banc reconsideration was disposed of. Therefore, the case lasted for a total of 22 days from start to finish.</p> <p>Outcome: The case concluded with the denial of both the motion for emergency relief and the motion for en banc reconsideration, as evidenced by the memorandum opinion issued on April 11, 2025, and the subsequent disposal of the reconsideration motion on May 1, 2025. The record was filed multiple times, indicating ongoing procedural activity, but ultimately no relief was granted to the petition for writ of mandamus filed on April 10, 2025.</p> <p>Complexity: The case is a mandamus proceeding, indicating a request for a court order to compel a government official or entity to perform a duty. The docket reflects multiple motions, including for emergency relief and en banc reconsideration, both of which were denied, suggesting a contentious legal environment. The frequent filings and the issuance of a memorandum opinion demonstrate that the case involved significant legal arguments and procedural complexities, although it ultimately did not advance favorably for the petitioner. Overall, the case appears to be of moderate complexity, given the number of procedural motions and the nature of the relief sought.</p> <p>Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor does it specify that any were hired by Charles Dustin Myers, the Relator. The case primarily revolves around Myers' filing of motions, including a petition for writ of mandamus and requests for emergency relief, all of which were denied by the court.</p> <p>Monetary value: The case does not specify a monetary amount, indicating it may involve procedural or jurisdictional issues rather than a straightforward financial dispute, making it impossible to ascertain its size from a monetary perspective.</p>

IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, indicating that he is the party bringing the petition for a writ of mandamus. As such, he acts in the capacity of the plaintiff or seeking party in this legal matter, while the respondent is David L. Evans.</p>

<p>Status: The case is ongoing as indicated by multiple entries dated 05/19/2025, including the filing of a Petition for Writ of Mandamus and an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs on behalf of Charles Dustin Myers. These filings suggest that the case has not concluded and remains under consideration by the court.</p> <p>Background: The cause of action is a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating a request for a court order to compel an official to perform a duty that is required by law. The supporting documents include an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs, suggesting that Myers may be seeking relief without the burden of court fees, and a Mandamus Record that likely outlines the circumstances prompting the petition. The filings were all submitted on May 19, 2025, reflecting a coordinated effort to initiate the legal action.</p>

<p>Motion practice: On May 19, 2025, Charles Dustin Myers, serving as the Relator, demonstrated a proactive approach in seeking judicial relief by filing multiple documents related to his petition for a Writ of Mandamus. His filings included the Petition for Writ of Mandamus, an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs, and the Case Record, all submitted on the same date, indicating a comprehensive effort to address his legal standing and pursue the desired relief through mandamus proceedings.</p>

<p>Duration: The case was initiated on May 19, 2025, with the filing of multiple documents, including a Petition for Writ of Mandamus and an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs, all filed on the same date. Since there are no subsequent entries or dismissal dates provided in the docket, the duration of the case from start to finish remains indeterminate as it appears to have not progressed beyond the initial filings.</p>

<p>Outcome: On May 19, 2025, Charles Dustin Myers initiated legal proceedings by filing a Petition for Writ of Mandamus, accompanied by an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs and a Mandamus Record. The filings indicate that Myers is seeking judicial intervention, likely to compel a governmental body or official to perform a duty owed to him, while also asserting his financial incapacity to bear court costs. The outcome of the case is not detailed in the docket entries provided, leaving the resolution and subsequent developments uncertain.</p>

<p>Complexity: The case is a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating a request for the court to compel a lower court or government official to perform a duty they are legally obligated to complete. The docket entries suggest a straightforward procedural case, as evidenced by the filing of the petition and supporting documents, including an affidavit of inability to pay court costs. The absence of complex issues or multiple parties indicates that the case is not particularly complex.</p>

<p>Experts: The docket entries indicate that Charles Dustin Myers, the Relator, was proactive in filing a Petition for Writ of Mandamus along with an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs and the Case Record on May 19, 2025. However, there is no mention of any experts being involved in the case, either as consultants or witnesses. Therefore, it can be concluded that no experts were hired by him

or any other party in this matter.</p> <p>Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that Charles Dustin Myers filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus, along with an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs. However, there are no specific monetary claims or amounts detailed in the entries. Therefore, it is unclear how large the case is from a monetary perspective, but given the context of a mandamus action, it likely does not involve significant monetary damages, potentially suggesting an amount less than \$10,000.</p>

[In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, which indicates that he is the party initiating the action for a writ of mandamus. This designation typically signifies that he is acting as the Plaintiff in this context, seeking relief from the court.</p>

<p>Status: The case is not finished and remains open, as evidenced by the recent filings and motions, including a petition for writ of mandamus filed on May 1, 2025, and ongoing motions for en banc reconsideration and emergency relief that have been denied. The latest activity indicates that the case is still active with potential further proceedings.</p>

<p>Background: The cause of action in this case involves a petition for a writ of mandamus, which was filed on multiple occasions between April 14 and May 1, 2025. The factual background indicates that motions for emergency relief and en banc reconsideration were also filed and subsequently denied, suggesting that the petitioner sought to compel a lower court or governmental authority to perform a duty that they allegedly failed to execute. The timeline indicates ongoing legal efforts to obtain relief through various motions, reflecting a significant urgency in the matter.</p>

<p>Motion practice: In the case, Charles Dustin Myers served as the Relator, initiating the petition for a writ of mandamus on April 14, 2025, to compel action from the respondent, Jeffery N. Kaitcer. Myers engaged in motion practice by subsequently filing a motion for emergency relief on April 15, 2025, which was denied along with the accompanying memorandum opinion. He also sought en banc reconsideration through a motion filed on April 21, 2025, but this was similarly denied on April 24, 2025. Throughout the proceedings, Myers actively advocated for relief, highlighting his role in the legal process aimed at obtaining a favorable decision regarding the matters at hand.</p>

<p>Duration: The case lasted from April 14, 2025, when the petition for writ of mandamus was filed, until the last docket entry on May 1, 2025, when the petition was officially filed. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was 17 days.</p>

<p>Outcome: The Court of Appeals for the Second Appellate District of Texas denied Charles Dustin Myers' petition for a writ of mandamus and his emergency motion to stay proceedings, reflecting a firm dismissal of his requests for

extraordinary relief.</p> <p>Complexity: The case presents a moderate level of complexity, as indicated by the procedural motions and the nature of the petition for a writ of mandamus, despite the court's straightforward denial of the requests.</p> <p>Experts: There were no experts involved in the case, and Charles Dustin Myers did not hire any experts as part of his role as the Relator.</p> <p>Monetary value: The case lacks specific monetary claims or damages, making it indeterminate in size from a monetary perspective.</p>

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

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the Defendant in the case, while GEICO County Mutual Insurance Company serves as the Plaintiff. The docket entries indicate that a citation was issued for Myers, which has not yet been served, suggesting ongoing procedural steps in the litigation process. The Plaintiff's Original Petition was filed on September 10, 2020, indicating the initiation of the legal action against Myers.</p> <p>Status: The case is still ongoing as indicated by the current status of "Citation Issued" and the recent docket entries from September 2020, which show that the citation for the defendant, Charles Dustin Myers, remains unserved. This suggests that no significant progress has been made towards resolution or closure of the case.</p> <p>Background: The cause of action in this case appears to stem from a complaint initiated by the plaintiff, Charles Dustin Myers, as indicated by the filing of the "Plaintiff's Original Petition" on September 10, 2020. The docket entries suggest that the defendant has not yet been served, as indicated by the "Unserved" status noted on September 11, 2020. Further details regarding the specific claims or factual background of the case are not provided in the docket entries.</p> <p>Motion practice: The docket entries indicate that as of September 11, 2020, Charles Dustin Myers, the Defendant, has not yet been served with the citation related to the claims brought against him by GEICO County Mutual Insurance Company. The service request was initiated on the same day, and the Plaintiff's Original Petition was filed the day prior, suggesting that the case is at an early stage with pending service of process. Myers's ability to respond to the claims is contingent upon proper service, which has not yet occurred.</p> <p>Duration: The case was filed on September 10, 2020, and the first docket entries occurred the following day, September 11, 2020. As there are no subsequent entries indicating resolution or dismissal, the case has not been concluded. Therefore, it remains open as of the last entries recorded. The duration from filing to the latest activity is thus ongoing since September 10, 2020.</p> <p>Outcome: The case involves Charles Dustin Myers as the defendant, with the plaintiff having filed an Original Petition on September 10, 2020. As of September 11, 2020, a

citation was issued but has not yet been served, as indicated by the "Unserved" status of the citation. The service request was made through EZ Messenger, suggesting an attempt to expedite the process. The overall case status remains pending due to the unserved citation.</p>

<p>Complexity: The case appears to be relatively straightforward, as indicated by the lack of complexity in the docket entries. The primary actions involve the filing of the Plaintiff's Original Petition and the issuance of unserved citations, suggesting that the matter has not yet progressed to substantive legal disputes or motions. The service request indicates an early stage in the litigation process, with no additional complexities or complications evident from the available entries.</p> <p>Experts: The docket entries indicate that Charles Dustin Myers, the Defendant, has not yet been served with the citation as of September 11, 2020, and there is no mention of any experts involved in the case. Consequently, it cannot be determined from the available information whether any experts were hired by Myers, as the docket does not reflect their involvement.</p> <p>Monetary value: The docket reveals that the case involves a plaintiff's original petition filed on September 10, 2020, but lacks specific monetary claims or damages. Without further details on the nature of the complaint or damages sought, it is challenging to estimate the monetary value of the case. Based on typical civil litigation, one could speculate a range from a few thousand to potentially several hundred thousand dollars, depending on the context of the claims involved.</p>

[Myers v. Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the Defendant in the case, as indicated by his role in the Notice of Removal and his representation in the docket entries. Additionally, he is associated with the defendant's counsel, while Morgan Michelle Myers is listed as the Plaintiff.</p> <p>Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the "CLOSED" flag and the termination date of 12/06/2024, when the court ordered the case to be remanded to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The last relevant docket entry was made on that same date, confirming the conclusion of proceedings in this case.</p> <p>Background: The cause of action in this case involves a Notice of Removal filed by defendant Charles Dustin Myers, indicating that the case was initially brought in a state court and subsequently removed to federal court under 28 U.S.C. § 1441. The factual background leading to the removal is not explicitly detailed in the docket entries, but the case was ultimately remanded to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, as determined by Judge Reed C. O'Connor.</p> <p>Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, identified as a Defendant in this case, has actively engaged in motion practice by filing a

Notice of Removal, which included extensive attachments indicating his legal strategy and arguments. His representation is confirmed through the presence of legal counsel, Cooper L. Carter from Marx Altman & Johnson, along with a Certificate of Interested Persons/Disclosure Statement, demonstrating compliance with procedural requirements. However, the case was ultimately remanded to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, highlighting a significant setback in Myers' attempts to maintain the case in federal court.

Duration: The case lasted from December 4, 2024, when it was filed, to December 6, 2024, when it was terminated, resulting in a duration of just two days. The case was remanded to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, due to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Outcome: The case was remanded to the 322nd Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas on December 6, 2024, due to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction, as ordered by Judge Reed C. O'Connor. The Clerk of Court was directed to return the case following standard protocol, effectively closing the case. The plaintiff, Charles Dustin Myers, had previously filed a notice of removal, but the federal court found that it did not have jurisdiction to hear the matter. The case is now officially closed as of December 6, 2024.

Complexity: The case involves a notice of removal filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating the complexity revolves around jurisdictional issues, as evidenced by the order remanding the case due to lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The docket entries suggest procedural motions and a significant number of attachments, which may imply a more detailed factual background, but ultimately the case was closed after being remanded to the state court. Overall, while there are multiple filings and procedural steps, the core issue appears to be straightforward concerning jurisdiction.

Experts: The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case. Charles Dustin Myers, identified as a Defendant, is actively represented by legal counsel, but there is no mention of expert witnesses being hired or utilized in the proceedings.

Monetary value: The docket does not specify a monetary amount sought in the case, as it primarily pertains to procedural matters, including a notice of removal and subsequent remand due to lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Therefore, a rough estimate cannot be provided based on the available information. The filing fee noted was \$405.00, indicating some level of monetary consideration, but this does not reflect the potential damages or claims of the case itself.

IN RE CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS

Extract

Summary

Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, which indicates that he is the party filing the petition for a writ of mandamus. This role typically signifies that he is seeking relief from the

court, positioning him as the plaintiff in this particular legal action.</p><p>Status: The docket indicates that multiple filings occurred on May 27, 2025, including a Petition for Writ of Mandamus and an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs, all on behalf of Charles Dustin Myers. Since these filings suggest ongoing legal proceedings and the case has not reached a resolution, it can be concluded that the case has not finished and is still open.</p> <p>Background: The cause of action in this case is the filing of a Petition for Writ of Mandamus on behalf of Charles Dustin Myers, indicating a request for the court to compel a lower tribunal or official to perform a duty mandated by law. The accompanying Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs suggests that Myers may be seeking relief in a context where financial constraints are a factor in pursuing his claim. The case was initiated on May 27, 2025, with multiple filings indicating procedural steps taken by the petitioner.</p> <p>Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, serving as the Relator in this case, filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus on May 27, 2025, demonstrating his proactive legal strategy. On the same date, he also submitted an affidavit of inability to pay court costs and a letter, alongside the mandamus record, indicating thorough preparation and commitment to obtaining the relief sought. This coordinated effort highlights his determination to navigate the legal process effectively.</p> <p>Duration: The case commenced on May 27, 2025, with the filing of a Petition for Writ of Mandamus and related documents on behalf of Charles Dustin Myers. As there are no subsequent docket entries indicating any further actions or resolutions, the case appears to have lasted only a single day.</p> <p>Outcome: On May 27, 2025, Charles Dustin Myers filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus along with an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs, indicating a request for the court to compel a certain action. The case record and a letter were also filed on the same day, suggesting that the case is in its initial stages and may involve issues related to financial constraints and procedural challenges. The outcome of the case will depend on the court's response to the petition and the merits of the claims presented.</p><p>Complexity: The case involves a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, indicating that the matter likely concerns a request to compel a governmental or public official to perform a duty. The docket entries indicate the filing of various documents, including an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs, suggesting potential issues related to financial constraints. Overall, the case appears to be relatively straightforward, focused on procedural aspects rather than complex legal arguments or extensive discovery.</p> <p>Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case. Charles Dustin Myers, as the Relator, took proactive steps by filing the Petition for Writ of Mandamus, an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs, and other related documents on the same date, but there is no mention of expert witnesses or consultants associated with his filings.</p> <p>Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that the case involves a Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed on behalf of Charles Dustin Myers, along with an Affidavit of Inability to Pay Court Costs. However, there is no mention of any specific monetary amount involved in the case, suggesting that it may not be a monetary dispute. Thus, it is difficult to estimate the monetary value of the case, as the nature of the relief sought does not appear to involve a financial claim.</p>

[In re Charles Dustin Myers](#)

Extract

Summary

<p>Role: Charles Dustin Myers is identified as the "Relator" in the case, which indicates that he is the party initiating the writ of mandamus.

This positions him in the role of Plaintiff, seeking relief from the court against the Respondent, Kenneth E. Newell. Morgan Michelle Myers is noted as the "Real party in interest," further clarifying the context of the case.</p> <p>Status: The case is not yet closed, as the most recent entry indicates that a petition for writ of mandamus was filed on May 7, 2025. Prior motions for emergency relief and en banc reconsideration were denied, but the ongoing filings suggest further proceedings are likely. Therefore, the case remains active and unresolved.</p>

<p>Background: The case involves a petition for writ of mandamus filed by Charles Dustin Myers, seeking urgent court intervention related to unspecified underlying issues, as indicated by multiple filings and motions for emergency relief, although specific details regarding the cause of action and factual background are not provided in the documents.</p>

<p>Motion practice: Charles Dustin Myers, serving as the Relator in this case, actively engaged in motion practice by filing a petition for a writ of mandamus on two occasions (April 16 and May 7, 2025). His efforts included requests for emergency relief and motions for en banc reconsideration, both of which were ultimately denied, indicating a vigorous pursuit of judicial intervention to compel a lower court or official to fulfill their legal duties. The docket reflects his persistent involvement and attempts to secure favorable rulings, underscoring his commitment to the case.</p>

<p>Duration: The case commenced with the filing of the petition for writ of mandamus on April 16, 2025, and concluded with the final entry regarding the motion for en banc reconsideration being disposed on May 1, 2025. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately 15 days.</p>

<p>Outcome: The Court of Appeals for the Second Appellate District of Texas denied Charles Dustin Myers' petition for writ of mandamus and all associated motions for emergency relief, affirming the lower court's decision and concluding the proceedings without granting any relief.</p>

<p>Complexity: The case presents a paradox of complexity in procedural aspects, indicated by multiple motions and significant legal issues, while the substantive legal matters appear straightforward and uncomplicated based on the court's succinct denial of the petition.</p>

<p>Experts: There is no evidence of any experts being involved in the case, nor is there any indication that Charles Dustin Myers hired experts as part of his efforts in seeking judicial intervention.</p>

<p>Monetary value: The case appears to be procedural in nature with no specific monetary claims or damages indicated, suggesting a minor financial implication, if any, likely in the range of thousands.</p>

This memo was compiled by Vincent AI based on vLex materials available as of June 10, 2025. [View full answer on vLex](#)