

## **Question**

Is it improper for a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures?

## **Answer (Texas)**

### **Short response**

Based on Texas law, it would be improper for a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures, as Texas statutes and case law explicitly assign these responsibilities to judges. The Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, Texas Government Code, and numerous court decisions clearly establish that only judges have the authority to handle recusal procedures, with the responsibility falling specifically on the judge subject to recusal or the regional presiding judge.

### **Summary**

Texas law establishes a clear and mandatory procedure for handling motions to recuse judges. When a motion to recuse is filed, the judge who is the subject of the motion must either sign an order of recusal or refer the motion to the regional presiding judge for consideration. This procedure is explicitly outlined in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a and Texas Government Code § 74.059(c)(3), which place the responsibility for these actions solely on judges, not court coordinators or other court staff.

Courts across Texas have consistently held that the recusal procedure is mandatory and must be followed precisely as outlined in the applicable rules and statutes. The Texas Supreme Court has affirmed that the judge subject to a recusal motion must either recuse themselves or request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear the motion. No Texas authority grants court coordinators the power to handle these procedures, and allowing them to do so would contradict the express provisions of Texas law that vest this responsibility exclusively with judges.

## **Background and Relevant Legislation**

### **Texas Administrative Code**

The Texas Administrative Code provides specific guidance on the procedures for disqualification or recusal of judges. [1 Tex. Admin. Code § 155.152](#) states that a judge is subject to recusal or disqualification on the same grounds and under the same circumstances as specified in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18b. Importantly, the code specifies that "If the presiding judge who is the subject of the motion disqualifies or recuses him- or herself based on the motion, the Chief Judge or a designee of the Chief Judge shall assign a different presiding judge to the case. If the presiding judge who is the subject of the motion does not disqualify or recuse him- or herself from the case, the Chief Judge or a designee of the Chief Judge shall assign another judge to consider and rule on the motion."

This provision explicitly designates the responsibility for handling recusal procedures to judicial officers—specifically the Chief Judge or their designee—rather than to court coordinators or other non-judicial staff members. The language is clear that it is the Chief Judge (or their designee) who has the authority to assign judges in recusal matters, not court coordinators.

### **Texas Government Code**

The Texas Government Code further clarifies the procedures for recusal motions. As noted in [In re Alpert, 276 S.W.3d 592 \(Tex. App. 2008\)](#), Texas Government Code vests the "presiding judge of the administrative judicial district" with the authority to assign a judge to hear a motion for recusal.

More specifically, [In re Norman, 191 S.W.3d 858 \(Tex. App. 2006\)](#) references section 74.059(c)(3) of the Government Code, which states that a district, statutory probate, or statutory county court judge shall "request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear a motion relating to the recusal of the judge from a case pending in his court." This provision places the responsibility squarely on the judge, not any other court personnel such as a coordinator.

### **Texas Rules of Civil Procedure**

The Texas Rules of Civil Procedure establish the mandatory procedure for handling recusal motions. [In re Burns](#) clarifies that under "Tex.R.Civ.P. 18a(f)" a respondent judge, within three business days after a motion to recuse is filed, must sign and file with the clerk (1) an order of recusal or disqualification; or (2) an order referring the motion to the regional presiding judge.

Similarly, [In re Amir-Sharif, NUMBER 13-19-00573-CV \(Tex. App. Dec 12, 2019\)](#) references Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1), which states that: "[r]egardless of whether the motion complies with this rule, the respondent judge, within three business days after the motion is filed, must either: (A) sign and file with the clerk an order of recusal or disqualification; or (B) sign and file with the clerk an order referring the motion to the regional presiding judge."

These procedural rules clearly assign the responsibility for handling recusal motions to the judge who is the subject of the motion, not to court coordinators or other administrative staff. The rules require the judge to take specific actions within a defined timeframe, indicating that this is a judicial function that cannot be delegated to non-judicial personnel.

## **Analysis of Case Law**

Texas courts have consistently interpreted these statutory provisions and procedural rules as creating a mandatory framework for handling recusal motions that must be followed by judges. The case law uniformly supports the conclusion that it is improper for a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures.

### **Mandatory Nature of Recusal Procedures**

The Texas Supreme Court established in [McLeod v. Harris](#), 582 S.W.2d 772 (Tex. 1979) that the statutory requirement for a judge to request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear a recusal motion is mandatory. The court stated that "The statute merely requires that another judge be assigned to determine the merits of the motion." This decision established the foundational principle that recusal procedures must be handled by judges, not by other court personnel.

This principle was reiterated in [Hudson v. Texas Children's Hosp.](#), 177 S.W.3d 232 (Tex. 2005), where the Texas Supreme Court confirmed that "The Texas Supreme Court has held that the recuse or refer procedure is mandatory." The court explained that "Once a motion to recuse is filed in statutory probate court, the trial judge has two options before taking any other action: (1) recuse himself or (2) request that the presiding judge of the statutory probate courts assign a judge to hear the motion to recuse."

Similarly, [Rio Grande Valley Gas Co., In re](#), 987 S.W.2d 167 (Tex. App. 1999) emphasized that "In 1979, the Texas Supreme Court held the requirements of article 200a, § 6 were mandatory and a district judge must request the presiding judge to assign a judge to hear any motion to recuse." The court noted that the substance of that provision is now found in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a and Texas Government Code § 74.059(c)(3).

### Limited Options for Judges

Multiple Texas court decisions have emphasized that judges have only two options when faced with a recusal motion: recuse themselves or refer the motion to the presiding judge. [Mosley v. State](#), 141 S.W.3d 816 (Tex. App. 2004) stated that "In addition, when a motion to recuse is filed, a trial court has only two options: recusal or referral of the case to the presiding judge for a determination as to its merits." The court further noted that "Even if a motion to recuse is procedurally defective, the challenged judge must either grant the motion or refer the motion, so another judge can determine the merits of the motion to recuse."

[Woodruff v. Wright](#), 51 S.W.3d 727 (Tex. App. 2001) similarly held that "When a motion to recuse has been filed, a judge must either recuse himself or request the presiding administrative judge to assign another judge to hear the motion."

[Barron v. State Atty. Gen.](#), 108 S.W.3d 379 (Tex. App. 2003) provides additional detail on the procedure, noting that "Before proceeding further in the case, the judge must either recuse himself or, if he declines recusal, request the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district to assign a judge to hear the motion."

[In re A.T.M., NO. 09-19-00032-CV](#) (Tex. App. Sep 24, 2020) reaffirms this understanding, stating that "Upon receiving a motion to recuse, a trial judge has two choices: (1) they can sign an order of recusal; or (2) refer the motion to the regional presiding judge."

### Authority to Assign Judges in Recusal Matters

The case law also clarifies who has the authority to assign judges in recusal matters. [In re Alpert](#), 276 S.W.3d 592 (Tex. App. 2008) states that "Both the Texas Government Code and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure vest the 'presiding judge of the administrative judicial district' with the authority to assign a judge to hear motion for recusal." The court also noted that "the applicable Rule of Civil Procedure designates the presiding administrative judicial district judge-or, in some cases, the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court-to undertake that particular task."

This explicit designation of authority to the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district (or in some cases the Chief Justice) precludes court coordinators from having any role in assigning judges to hear recusal motions.

### Secondary Materials on Recusal Procedures

Secondary materials consistently reinforce the understanding established in the statutes and case law. Trial motions states that "Once a sufficient motion to recuse has been filed, before proceeding further in the case, the judge must either recuse himself or request the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district to assign a judge to hear the motion under Tex. Gov't Code §74.059(c)(3)."

Similarly, Pretrial Motions reiterates that "Once a sufficient motion to recuse has been filed, before proceeding further in the case, the judge must either recuse himself or request the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district to assign a judge to hear the motion under Tex. Gov't Code §74.059(c)(3)."

These secondary sources align with the primary authorities in emphasizing that the responsibility for handling recusal procedures lies with judges, not with court coordinators or other non-judicial personnel.

### Analysis of the Propriety of Court Coordinator Involvement

Based on the legislation and case law reviewed, it would be improper for a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures in Texas courts for several key reasons:

#### 1. Explicit Statutory Assignment of Responsibility

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1) explicitly requires that the "respondent judge" must take specific actions within three business days of a recusal motion being filed. The rule leaves no room for delegation to non-judicial personnel such as court coordinators, as it specifically assigns this responsibility to the judge. Similarly, Texas Government Code § 74.059(c)(3) states that a judge "shall request the presiding judge to assign another judge" to hear a recusal motion, again placing this responsibility specifically on the judge.

#### 2. Judicial Function Requiring Judicial Authorization

The handling of recusal procedures involves judicial decision-making and authority. The judge must decide whether to recuse or refer the motion, and only certain judicial officers (the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district or the Chief Justice) have the authority to assign judges to hear recusal motions. Court coordinators, as non-judicial personnel, lack the authority to make these decisions or assignments.

#### 3. Mandatory Nature of Recusal Procedures

Texas courts have consistently held that the recusal procedures outlined in the rules and statutes are mandatory and must be followed precisely. The Texas Supreme Court in [McLeod v. Harris, 582 S.W.2d 772 \(Tex. 1979\)](#) and subsequent cases have emphasized the mandatory nature of these procedures. Allowing a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures would constitute a departure from these mandatory procedures.

#### **4. Limited Options Available to Judges**

The case law consistently states that judges have only two options when faced with a recusal motion: recuse themselves or refer the motion to the presiding judge. There is no provision for a third option of delegating the handling of recusal procedures to a court coordinator or other non-judicial personnel.

#### **5. Absence of Authority Granting Court Coordinators This Role**

None of the statutory provisions or cases reviewed mentions court coordinators as having any role in handling recusal procedures. In fact, [1 Tex. Admin. Code § 155.152](#) specifically states that if a judge recuses based on a motion, "the Chief Judge or a designee of the Chief Judge shall assign a different presiding judge to the case," and if the judge does not recuse, "the Chief Judge or a designee of the Chief Judge shall assign another judge to consider and rule on the motion." This language clearly indicates that the responsibility for assigning judges in recusal matters lies with the Chief Judge or their designee, not with court coordinators.

### **Potential Counterarguments and Their Limitations**

#### **Argument: Court Coordinators Perform Administrative Functions**

One might argue that court coordinators perform various administrative functions in the court system, and handling the paperwork or logistics related to recusal motions could be considered an administrative function. However, this argument fails because:

The rules and statutes specifically assign the responsibility for handling recusal motions to judges, not to administrative staff.

The handling of recusal motions involves judicial decision-making (whether to recuse or refer), which is beyond the scope of administrative functions.

The assignment of judges to hear recusal motions is specifically vested in certain judicial officers (presiding judges or the Chief Justice), not in administrative staff.

#### **Argument: Delegation of Authority**

Another potential argument is that judges could delegate their authority to handle certain aspects of recusal procedures to court coordinators. However, this argument is also flawed because:

The rules and statutes use mandatory language ("must," "shall") that does not allow for delegation of these specific responsibilities.

Texas courts have consistently emphasized the mandatory nature of recusal procedures, indicating that they must be followed precisely as outlined in the rules and statutes.

The decision to recuse or refer a recusal motion is inherently judicial in nature and cannot be delegated to non-judicial personnel.

### **Exceptions and Caveats**

While the general rule is that court coordinators should not handle recusal procedures, there may be limited circumstances where court coordinators could perform purely ministerial functions related to recusal motions, such as:

Receiving and filing the initial recusal motion (though the responsibility for acting on the motion still lies with the judge).

Communicating the judge's decision to recuse or refer the motion to the appropriate parties, after the judge has made that decision.

Facilitating administrative communication between judges regarding recusal matters, provided that the actual decisions and orders are made and signed by the appropriate judges.

However, these limited ministerial functions do not constitute "handling recusal procedures" in the substantive sense, and court coordinators should not be making decisions, signing orders, or otherwise substantively involved in the recusal process.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the comprehensive review of Texas law regarding recusal procedures, it is clear that it would be improper for a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures. The Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, Texas Government Code, and numerous court decisions establish a mandatory framework for handling recusal motions that places the responsibility squarely on judges, not on court coordinators or other non-judicial personnel.

When a motion to recuse is filed, the judge who is the subject of the motion must either sign an order of recusal or refer the motion to the regional presiding judge. Only certain judicial officers—specifically the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district or, in some cases, the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court—have the authority to assign judges to hear recusal motions.

The mandatory nature of these procedures, as consistently affirmed by Texas courts, does not allow for delegation to court coordinators. The absence of any provision in the relevant statutes or case law granting court coordinators a role in handling recusal procedures further supports the conclusion that such involvement would be improper.

While court coordinators may perform limited ministerial functions related to the recusal process, substantive handling of recusal procedures—including making decisions on recusal motions or assigning judges to hear such motions—falls exclusively within the purview of judges as prescribed by Texas law. Any deviation from these established procedures would be contrary to the explicit requirements of Texas statutes, rules, and case law.

## Legal Authorities

[Rio Grande Valley Gas Co., In re, 987 S.W.2d 167 \(Tex. App. 1999\)](#)

### Texas Court of Appeals

#### Extract

*In 1979, the Texas Supreme Court held the requirements of article 200a, § 6 were mandatory and a district judge must request the presiding judge to assign a judge to hear any motion to recuse. McLeod v. Harris, 582 S.W.2d 772, 775 (Tex. 1979). The substance of article 200a, § 6 is now found in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a, promulgated by the supreme court and effective January 1, 1981, and TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 74.059(c)(3). Keene, 863 S.W.2d at 183. Section 74.059(c)(3) provides, in pertinent part: (c) A district, statutory probate, or statutory county court judge shall: .... (3) request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear a motion relating to the recusal of the judge from a case pending in his court[.] (emphasis added).*

#### Summary

The procedure for handling recusal motions is clearly defined by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a and TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 74.059(c)(3). These rules mandate that a judge must either recuse themselves or request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear the motion. This suggests that the responsibility for handling recusal procedures lies with the judges and not with court coordinators.

[In re Norman, 191 S.W.3d 858 \(Tex. App. 2006\)](#)

### Texas Court of Appeals

#### Extract

*Under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a, Judge Austin had a mandatory duty either to recuse himself or to refer the recusal motion to the presiding judge. TEX.R. CIV. P. 18a. Furthermore, section 74.059(c)(3) of the Government Code states that a district, statutory probate, or statutory county court judge shall 'request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear a motion relating to the recusal of the judge from a case pending in his court.' TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 74.059(c)(3) (Vernon 2005).*

#### Summary

Texas law mandates that a judge, upon receiving a recusal motion, must either recuse themselves or refer the motion to the presiding judge. This indicates that the responsibility for handling recusal procedures lies with the judge and not with a court coordinator. The passage does not mention any role for a court coordinator in this process, suggesting that it would be improper for a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures.

[Barron v. State Atty. Gen., 108 S.W.3d 379 \(Tex. App. 2003\)](#)

### Texas Court of Appeals

#### Extract

*Rule 18a of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure governs recusal of judges. TEX.R. CIV. P. 18a. In order to recuse a judge, any party may file a motion stating grounds why the judge before whom the case is pending should not sit in the case. TEX.R. CIV. P. 18a(a). The motion must be filed at least ten days before the date set for trial or other hearing, be verified, and state with particularity the grounds for recusal. Id. Before proceeding further in the case, the judge must either recuse himself or, if he declines recusal, request the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district to assign a judge to hear the motion. TEX.R. CIV. P. 18a(c), (d).*

#### Summary

Procedure for recusal of judges as per Rule 18a of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. It specifies that a motion for recusal must be filed by a party, and the judge in question must either recuse themselves or request the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district to assign another judge to hear the motion. The passage does not mention any role for a court coordinator in handling recusal procedures, suggesting that the process is strictly judicial and administrative in nature, involving judges and presiding judges.

[Woodruff v. Wright, 51 S.W.3d 727 \(Tex. App. 2001\)](#)

## Texas Court of Appeals

### Extract

*When a motion to recuse has been filed, a judge must either recuse himself or request the presiding administrative judge to assign another judge to hear the motion. Tex. R. Civ. P. 18a(a),(c),(d).*

### Summary

The passage from "Woodruff v. Wright" refers to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, specifically Rule 18a, which outlines the procedure for handling recusal motions. According to this rule, when a motion to recuse is filed, the judge in question must either recuse themselves or request the presiding administrative judge to assign another judge to hear the motion. This indicates that the responsibility for handling recusal procedures lies with the judge and the presiding administrative judge, not with a court coordinator. Therefore, it would be improper for a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures, as this responsibility is specifically assigned to judges by the rules.

## In re Burns

### Texas Court of Appeals

### Extract

*A respondent judge, within three business days after a motion to recuse is filed, must sign and file with the clerk (1) an order of recusal or disqualification; or (2) an order referring the motion to the regional presiding judge. Tex.R.Civ.P. 18a(f).*

### Summary

The Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 18a(f) specify that a respondent judge is responsible for handling recusal procedures by either signing an order of recusal or disqualification or referring the motion to the regional presiding judge. The passage does not mention any role for a court coordinator in this process, indicating that it is the judge's responsibility.

## In re Alpert, 276 S.W.3d 592 (Tex. App. 2008)

### Texas Court of Appeals

### Extract

*Both the Texas Government Code and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure vest the 'presiding judge of the administrative judicial district' with the authority to assign a judge to hear a motion for recusal. TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 25.00255; TEX.R. CIV. P. 18a. ... Unlike the Texas Government Code, which is silent on the issue of who may reassign a case after recusal is granted, the applicable Rule of Civil Procedure designates the presiding administrative judicial district judge-or, in some cases, the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court-to undertake that particular task. TEX.R. CIV. P. 18a(f).*

### Summary

The authority to assign a judge to hear a motion for recusal is vested in the "presiding judge of the administrative judicial district" according to both the Texas Government Code and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The passage also notes that the Texas Government Code is silent on who may reassign a case after recusal is granted, but the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure specify that this task is for the presiding administrative judicial district judge or, in some cases, the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court. This indicates that a court coordinator does not have the authority to handle recusal procedures.

## In re Amir-Sharif, NUMBER 13-19-00573-CV (Tex. App. Dec 12, 2019)

### Texas Court of Appeals

### Extract

*Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1) governs the duties of the respondent judge when a party files a motion to recuse. See TEX. R. CIV. P. 18a(f)(1). This rule states that: '[r]egardless of whether the motion complies with this rule, the respondent judge, within three business days after the motion is filed, must either: (A) sign and file with the clerk an order of recusal or disqualification; or (B) sign and file with the clerk an order referring the motion to the regional presiding judge.'*

### Summary

The Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1) specifically outlines the duties of the respondent judge when a motion to recuse is filed. The rule mandates that the judge must either sign and file an order of recusal or refer the motion to the regional presiding judge. This indicates that the responsibility for handling recusal procedures lies with the judge, not a court coordinator. Therefore, it would be improper for a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures, as this duty is explicitly assigned to the judge by the rule.

**Texas Court of Appeals**

**Extract**

*Upon receiving a motion to recuse, a trial judge has two choices: (1) they can sign an order of recusal; or (2) refer the motion to the regional presiding judge. See Tex. R. Civ. P. 18a(f)(1)(A)-(B). Here, the trial judge's referral of the motion to recuse to the regional presiding judge was expressly authorized by the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. See id.*

**Summary**

Procedure for handling a motion to recuse in Texas, as per the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. It specifies that the trial judge has the authority to either recuse themselves or refer the motion to the regional presiding judge. The passage does not mention the role of a court coordinator in this process, indicating that the responsibility lies with the trial judge and the regional presiding judge.

[Hudson v. Texas Children's Hosp., 177 S.W.3d 232 \(Tex. 2005\)](#)

**Texas Supreme Court**

**Extract**

*Once a motion to recuse is filed in statutory probate court, the trial judge has two options before taking any other action: (1) recuse himself or (2) request that the presiding judge of the statutory probate courts assign a judge to hear the motion to recuse. Tex. Gov't Code Ann. § 25.00255(f) (Vernon 2004); TEX.R. CIV. P. 18a(c). The Texas Supreme Court has held that the recuse or refer procedure is mandatory. See McLeod v. Harris, 582 S.W.2d 772, 774 (Tex. 1979).*

**Summary**

When a motion to recuse is filed, the trial judge must either recuse themselves or refer the motion to the presiding judge of the statutory probate courts. This procedure is mandatory, as established by the Texas Supreme Court. The passage does not mention any role for a court coordinator in handling recusal procedures, suggesting that the involvement of a court coordinator in such matters would not align with the mandatory procedures outlined.

[Mosley v. State, 141 S.W.3d 816 \(Tex. App. 2004\)](#)

**Texas Court of Appeals**

**Extract**

*A motion to recuse seeks to prevent a judge from hearing a case because of a nonconstitutional reason. Even if a motion to recuse is procedurally defective, the challenged judge must either grant the motion or refer the motion, so another judge can determine the merits of the motion to recuse. ... In addition, when a motion to recuse is filed, a trial court has only two options: recusal or referral of the case to the presiding judge for a determination as to its merits.*

**Summary**

Procedural requirements for handling a motion to recuse in Texas. It specifies that the judge who is the subject of the recusal motion must either recuse themselves or refer the motion to another judge for a decision. This indicates that the responsibility for handling recusal procedures lies with the judges, not with court coordinators or other court staff.

[McLeod v. Harris, 582 S.W.2d 772 \(Tex. 1979\)](#)

**Texas Supreme Court**

**Extract**

*The question presented here is whether respondent, Honorable Edward J. Harris, Judge of the 10th Judicial District Court of Galveston County, is required by the provisions of Article 200a, Section 6 to request the Presiding Judge of the Second Administrative District to hear relator's motion to recuse Judge Harris... The statute merely requires that another judge be assigned to determine the merits of the motion.*

**Summary**

The passage from *McLeod v. Harris* discusses the procedure for handling a motion to recuse a judge in Texas. According to Article 200a, Section 6, the judge in question is required to request the Presiding Judge of the relevant Administrative District to assign another judge to hear the motion. This indicates that the responsibility for handling recusal procedures lies with the judges and not with court coordinators. The statute mandates that another judge, not a court coordinator, be assigned to determine the merits of the recusal motion.

## Extract

A judge is subject to recusal or disqualification on the same grounds and under the same circumstances as specified in TRCP Rule 18b. ... If the presiding judge who is the subject of the motion disqualifies or recuses him- or herself based on the motion, the Chief Judge or a designee of the Chief Judge shall assign a different presiding judge to the case. If the presiding judge who is the subject of the motion does not disqualify or recuse him- or herself from the case, the Chief Judge or a designee of the Chief Judge shall assign another judge to consider and rule on the motion.

## Summary

The Chief Judge or a designee of the Chief Judge is responsible for assigning a different presiding judge if a recusal or disqualification motion is granted. It does not mention any role for a court coordinator in handling these procedures, suggesting that it may be improper for a court coordinator to handle recusal procedures, as the responsibility is designated to the Chief Judge or their designee.

## Pretrial Motions

**Texas Criminal Lawyer's Handbook. Volume 1 - 2021 - James Publishing - Mark G. Daniel, Robert K. Gill - 2021-08-16**

## Extract

Once a sufficient motion to recuse has been filed, before proceeding further in the case, the judge must either recuse himself or request the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district to assign a judge to hear the motion under Tex. Gov't Code §74.059(c)(3). Sanchez.

## Summary

Once a motion to recuse is filed, the judge involved must either recuse themselves or request the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district to assign another judge to hear the motion. This suggests that the responsibility for handling recusal procedures lies with the judge and the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district, not with a court coordinator. The court coordinator's role is not mentioned in the context of handling recusal procedures, implying that it may be improper for them to do so.

## Trial motions

**Texas Criminal Forms - Volume 1-2 - James Publishing - Robert K. Gill, Mark Daniel - 2022-04-02**

## Extract

Once a sufficient motion to recuse has been filed, before proceeding further in the case, the judge must either recuse himself or request the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district to assign a judge to hear the motion under Tex. Gov't Code §74.059(c)(3).

## Summary

Once a motion to recuse is filed, the responsibility lies with the judge to either recuse themselves or request the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district to assign another judge to hear the motion. This suggests that the role of handling recusal procedures is specifically designated to judges and not to court coordinators. The passage does not mention any role for court coordinators in this process, implying that it would be improper for them to handle such procedures.