

Question

=====FILE: Gmail - Cause No. 322-744263-23 Request for Ruling on Submission - No-Evidence Summary Judgment.pdf=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Cause No.: 322-744263-23 Request for Ruling on Submission - No-Evidence Summary Judgment 4 messages FUDSTOP Mon, Dec 1, 2025 at 4:02 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" , Cooper Carter , "CSD-legal-914@oag.texas.gov" Good afternoon, In Cause No. 322-744263-23, the Respondent's No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment is fully briefed and the response deadline has passed. Respondent respectfully requests that the Court consider ruling on the motion on submission. Thank you for your time and assistance. Respectfully, Charles Dustin Myers Pro Se Respondent 817-546-3693 FUDSTOP Tue, Dec 9, 2025 at 10:24 AM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" , Cooper Carter , "CSD-legal- 914@oag.texas.gov" Good morning, This is a follow-up regarding Respondent's No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment, heard December 2, 2025, and taken under advisement. With final trial set for tomorrow, December 9, 2025 at 9:00 a.m., a ruling on the pending no-evidence motion is necessary, as it determines the scope — and existence — of any trial issues. I respectfully request that the Court enter its ruling on the no-evidence motion today, because the Court cannot determine what, if anything, remains for trial until the motion is ruled upon, and Respondent cannot prepare for trial without knowing whether any issues remain to be tried. Thank you for your attention. Respectfully, Charles Dustin Myers 817-546-3693 Chuckdustin12@gmail.com [Quoted text hidden] FUDSTOP Tue, Dec 9, 2025 at 10:25 AM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" , Cooper Carter , "CSD-legal- 914@oag.texas.gov" 12/13/25, 12:11 AM Gmail - Cause No.: 322-744263-23 Request for Ruling on Submission - No-Evidence Summary Judgment <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-a:r-5119833730598839222&simpl=msg-a:r-5668511824942...> 1/2 ---

Page 2 --- Correction: Trial is set December 10th — urgency remains given the closeness of the setting. Thank you again. On Mon, Dec 1, 2025, 4:02 PM FUDSTOP wrote: [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Tue, Dec 9, 2025 at 12:25 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , "CSD-legal- 914@oag.texas.gov" Attached please find a "letter ruling" from Judge James Munford. Thank you, Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 F r o m : FUDSTOP S e n t : Tuesday, December 9, 2025 10:26 AM T o : Lindsey K. Baker ; Cooper Carter ; CSD- legal-914@oag.texas.gov S u b j e c t : Re: Cause No.: 322-744263-23 Request for Ruling on Submission - No-Evidence Summary Judgment EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT! Think Before You Click! [Quoted text hidden] Myers-Letter Ruling.pdf 52K12/13/25, 12:11 AM Gmail - Cause No.: 322-744263-23 Request for Ruling on Submission - No-Evidence Summary Judgment <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-a:r-5119833730598839222&simpl=msg-a:r-5668511824942...> 2/2 =====

FILE: Gmail - FW_ 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan

& Charles Myers.pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP FW: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan & Charles Myers 7 messages Lindsey K. Baker Tue, Oct 22, 2024 at 11:38 AM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter , "Linda Y. Vera" , Victoria Weaver Attached please find an Order Setting Videoconference Hearing on October 30, 2024 at 2:30 p.m. The Zoom ID is 899 8307 1065. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 ----Original Message----- From: Tracy Kemp Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 8:53 AM To: Lindsey K. Baker Subject: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan & Charles Myers Attached is an Order Setting Videoconference Hearing on the Joint Motion to Recuse Judge Munford and Judge Kaitcer. Judge Evans has scheduled the videoconference hearing for October 30, 2024, at 2:30 p.m. Would you please provide a copy of the order to all parties and/or counsel and to your court reporter? Thank you. Tracy Kemp Administrative Assistant Eighth Administrative Judicial Region Tom Vandergriff Civil Courts Building 100 N. Calhoun St., 2nd Floor Fort Worth, Tx. 76196-1148 Phone (817) 884-1558 Fax (817) 884-1560 322-744263-23 ITMOTMO Morgan & Charles Myers Order Setting Videoconference Hearing on Joint Motion to Recuse.pdf 166K Charlie Vids Wed, Oct 23, 2024 at 9:14 AM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Cooper Carter , "Linda Y. Vera" , Victoria Weaver Ms. Baker, 12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - FW: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan & Charles Myers <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1813632880731935065&simpl=msg-f:1813632880731935...> 1/7 ---

Page 2 --- Thank you for your continued correspondence in this matter. I must bring several procedural issues to your attention regarding the upcoming hearing. The Texas Office of the Attorney General (OAG), a named party to this suit since June 28, 2024, has not been CC'ed on the Order Setting Hearing signed by the Honorable David L. Evans. The OAG must receive proper notice to participate effectively. (Holly Hayes) Additionally, the Order Setting Hearing lacks a Certificate of Service, and there has been no confirmation of docketing from the reSearch Texas vendor. If there is an alternative vendor to obtain receipt of filing and service, please advise how to access it to prevent further confusion. I request that these procedural requirements be met prior to setting the matter for hearing, or alternatively, that instructions be provided to ensure proper receipt of service and docketing to confirm all named parties to the suit have receipt of service and to ensure no further procedural delays occur. These requests are made for the purpose of maintaining public confidence in the judiciary, as there is growing public interest in this matter. The above will provide clarity and ensure that everyone is on the same page regarding the hearing. Thank you for your attention to these matters. Respectfully, Charles Myers chuckdustin12@gmail.com 817-507-6562 [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Wed, Oct 23, 2024 at 11:57 AM To: Charlie Vids , "CSD-legal-914@texasattorneygeneral.gov" , "CSD-legal-914@oag.texas.gov" Cc: Cooper Carter , "Linda Y. Vera" , Victoria Weaver I have included the Attorney General in this email, so they are aware of the hearing and receive a copy of the Order Setting Videoconference for October 30, 2024 at 2:00 p.m. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County

Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196
Phone: (817) 884-159712/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - FW: 322-744263-23 In
the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan & Charles Myers <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1813632880731935065&simpl=msg-f:1813632880731935... 2/7 ---
Page 3 --- From: Charlie Vids Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2024 9:15 AM
To: Lindsey K. Baker Cc: Cooper Carter ; Linda Y. Vera ; Victoria Weaver
Subject: Re: FW: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan
& Charles Myers EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT! Think Before You Click!
[Quoted text hidden] 322-744263-23 ITMOTMO Morgan & Charles
Myers Order Setting Videoconference Hearing on Joint Motion to Recuse.pdf
166K Lindsey K. Baker Wed, Oct 23, 2024 at 2:37 PM To: Charlie Vids ,
"CSD-legal-914@texasattorneygeneral.gov" , "CSD-
legal-914@oag.texas.gov" Cc: Cooper Carter , Victoria Weaver I apologize,
the start time is 2:30 p.m. pursuant to the Order, NOT 2:00 p.m. If you
received a Notice of Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The
Motion MUST be SET, HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO
RETAIN. DO NOT EMAIL ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP.
 YOU MUST APPEAR IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING.
 All Orders that require the Judge's signature must be presented in
person and will not be processed through e-filing. [Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - FW: 322-744263-23 In the
Matter of the Marriage of Morgan & Charles Myers <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1813632880731935065&simpl=msg-f:1813632880731935... 3/7 ---
Page 4 --- Charlie Vids Wed, Oct 23, 2024 at 3:09 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker"
Cc: "CSD-legal-914@texasattorneygeneral.gov" , "CSD-legal-
914@oag.texas.gov" , Cooper Carter , "Linda Y. Vera" , Victoria Weaver Ms.
Baker, Thanks for your quick response. I received the notification from
service through the e-filing system, however, some concerns remain
unaddressed. i. Could you please provide the status on the following
envelope numbers and why they have not been docketed? I need to ensure
that the record reflects an accurate account of the pleadings in this matter
in the event of technical issues: 1. Envelope Number: 92510702 //
Document: Motion (No Fee) // Submitted: 09/26/2024 4:47 P.M. CST //
Accepted: 9/27/2024 10:21 AM CST // Filer: CHARLES MYERS // Details:
EM. MOTION FOR TEMPORARY ORDERS issues: Has not been docketed on
the electronic filing manager. 2. Envelope Number: 92536276 // Document:
Amended Filing Submitted: 9/27/2024 12:12 PM CST // Accepted: 9/27/2024
12:29 PM CST // Filer: CHARLES MYERS // Details: First Amended Motion
for Temporary Orders issues: Has not been docketed on the electronic filing
manager. 3. Envelope Number: 92846417 // Document: Motion (No Fee) //
Submitted: 10/7/2024 7:30 AM CST // Accepted: 10/7/2024 10:46 AM CST //
Filer: CHARLES MYERS Details: Joint Motion to Recuse issues: Has not
been docketed on the electronic filing manager. 4. Envelope Number:
92959648 // Document: No Fee Documents // Submitted: 10/9/2024 10:38
AM CST Filer: KIM PERKINS Details: Order of referral from Honorable
James Munford issues: Contained an altered motion without exhibits and
affidavits, different file size than the original file uploaded to the electronic
filing manager. Has not been docketed on the electronic filing manager. 5.

Envelope Number: 92989465 // Document: Notice // Submitted: 10/9/2024 4:21 PM CST // Accepted: 10/10/2024 9:41 AM CST // Filer: CHARLES MYERS // Details: Notice regarding the discrepancies in the order of referral signed by Honorable James Munford. issues: Has not been docketed on the electronic filing manager.12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - FW: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan & Charles Myers <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1813632880731935... 4/7 ---
Page 5 --- 6. Envelope Number: 93021015 // Document: No Fee Documents // Submitted: 10/10/2024 12:11 PM CST // Filer: KIM PERKINS // Details: Amended order of referral issues: Has not been docketed on the electronic filing manager. Joint Motion to Recuse is not attached to the amended order. Reasons given for the amendment were in regard to the filing size being purportedly too large, requiring that it be split into three separate documents. 7. Envelope Number: 93024186 // Document: Request / Objection // Submitted: 10/10/2024 12:54 PM CST // Accepted: 10/10/2024 2:22 PM CST // Filer: CHARLES MYERS Details: Objection and request to docket the above mentioned. issues: Raised an objection due to the manner in which the case documents are being handled and requested that the missing filings be docketed as required by Tex. R. Civ. P. 21a. 8. Envelope Number: 93081805 // Document: No Fee Documents Submitted: 10/11/2024 2:39 PM CST Filer: SHERMA PROCTOR LUCAS Details: Order of Referral from Honorable Jeffrey Kaitcer issues: Has not been docketed on the electronic filing manager. 9. Envelope Number: 93089471 // Document: No Fee Documents Submitted: 10/11/2024 4:05 PM CST Filer: KIM PERKINS Details: Order of Referral from Honorable Jeffrey Kaitcer with attached motion. issues: Has not been docketed on the electronic filing manager. Was filed in one document. Raises more concerns as to why one judge would split the document for being too large, while another sends as one document. 10. Envelope Number: 93480293 // Document: No Fee Documents Submitted: 10/23/2024 12:24 PM CST Filer: SHERMA PROCTOR LUCAS Details: Order setting hearing on Joint Motion to Recuse issues: Has not been docketed on the electronic filing manager. Has no instructions for submitting evidence or disclosing witnesses who are expected to testify in regards to this matter. I would appreciate your assistance in resolving these discrepancies and clarifying why these documents have not been docketed. It is important for the record to reflect all filings accurately to ensure that all parties can proceed with clarity and full understanding. Additionally, regarding Envelope No. 93480293, I would be grateful if you could provide further guidance on submitting evidence and witness disclosures for the upcoming hearing, as this information is crucial for proper preparation. Given that anything filed is not docketed on the EFM, this is my only option as far as receiving answers. Thank you for all of your help with this matter in ensuring that the proceedings abide by Texas Procedure. For your technical staff, the case number on the EFM is:12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - FW: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan & Charles Myers <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1813632880731935... 5/7 ---

Page 6 --- b04183e55b355b628fa3d90671422f9b Respectfully, Charles Myers chuckdustin12@gmail.com 817-507-6562 [Quoted text hidden]

Lindsey K. Baker Wed, Oct 23, 2024 at 4:51 PM To: Charlie Vids Cc: Cooper Carter Your concerns below will need to be addressed with the Tarrant County District Clerk. If you received a Notice of Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The Motion MUST be SET, HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO RETAIN. DO NOT EMAIL ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP. YOU MUST APPEAR IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING. All Orders that require the Judge's signature must be presented in person and will not be processed through e-filing. Lindsey Baker [Quoted text hidden] [Quoted text hidden] Charlie Vids Thu, Oct 24, 2024 at 5:36 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Cooper Carter Thank you for the update. I've contacted the district clerk for assistance. Regarding instructions for submitting evidence, none was provided, so could you please forward the attached affidavit to the Regional Judge to ensure its on file?

12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - FW: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan & Charles Myers <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1813632880731935065&simpl=msg-f:1813632880731935...> 6/7 --- Page 7 --- Thank you. Respectfully, Charles Myers [Quoted text hidden] SCMAffavit.pdf 291K 12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - FW: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan & Charles Myers <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1813632880731935065&simpl=msg-f:1813632880731935...> 7/7

=====

FILE: Gmail - FW_ 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan and Charles Myers.pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP FW: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan and Charles Myers 1 message Lindsey K. Baker Tue, May 6, 2025 at 3:18 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , "CSD-LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Attached is an Order of Assignment for Senior Chief Justice John Cayce to preside in the motions to recuse. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 ----Original Message---- From: Tracy Kemp Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 2:48 PM To: Lindsey K. Baker Cc: judgecayce@gmail.com Subject: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan and Charles Myers Attached is an order of assignment for Senior Chief Justice John Cayce to preside in the motions to recuse filed in the above-referenced case. Please provide a copy of the order to all parties and/or counsel. Tracy Kemp Administrative Assistant Eighth Administrative Judicial Region Tom Vandergriff Civil Courts Building 100 N. Calhoun St., 2nd Floor Fort Worth, Tx. 76196-1148 Phone (817) 884-1558 Fax (817) 884-1560 20250506 OOA Tarrant Co - ITMOTMO Morgan & Charles Myers - 322 - Cayce, J.pdf 505K 12/13/25, 12:17 AM Gmail - FW: 322-744263-23 In the Matter of the Marriage of Morgan and Charles Myers <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1831403730206508729&simpl=msg-f:1831403730206508...> 1/1

=====

FILE: Gmail - FW_ Myers 322-744263-23 (12).pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP FW: Myers 322-744263-23 1 message Lindsey K.

Baker Wed, Oct 9, 2024 at 12:18 PM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter
Attached is correspondence from Judge Munford to Judge Evans and an Amended Order of Referral. Due to the length of the Joint Motion to Recusal, it is being sent as three attachments. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 From: Lindsey K. Baker Sent: Wednesday, October 9, 2024 12:17 PM To: Tracy Kemp Subject: Myers 322-744263-23 Dear Ms. Kemp: Attached is correspondence from Judge Munford and an Amended Order of Referral. Due to the length of the Joint Motion to Recusal, it is being sent as three attachments. 12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - FW: Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1812457658255143748&simpl=msg-f:1812457658255143...> 1/2 ---
Page 2 --- Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 3 attachments Myers-Part 1.pdf 2688K Myers-Part 2.pdf 2594K Myers-Part 3.pdf 2496K 12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - FW: Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1812457658255143748&simpl=msg-f:1812457658255143...> 2/2

=====

FILE: Gmail - FW_ Myers 322-744263-23 (3).pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP FW: Myers 322-744263-23 2 messages Lindsey K. Baker Tue, Sep 9, 2025 at 4:22 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , CSD-Legal-914 , "CSD-LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Dear Ms. Kemp: Attached is correspondence from Judge Munford to Judge Evans and an Order of Referral. Further, attached is correspondence from Judge Kaitcer to Judge Evans and an Order of Referral. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 From : Lindsey K. Baker Sent : Tuesday, September 9, 2025 4:16 PM To : Tracy Kemp Subject : Myers 322-744263-23 Dear Ms. Kemp: Attached is correspondence from Judge Munford and an Order of Referral. 12/13/25, 12:15 AM Gmail - FW: Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1842822989587015946&simpl=msg-f:1842822989587015...> 1/5 ---
Page 2 --- Further, attached is correspondence from Judge Kaitcer and an Order of Referral. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 4 attachments Correspondence-District.pdf 41K Order of Referral-District.pdf 523K Correspondence-Associate.pdf 36K Order of Referral-Associate.pdf 508K FUDSTOP Tue, Sep 9, 2025 at 10:48 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Cooper Carter , CSD-Legal-914 , "CSD-LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Ms. Baker, Just so I understand, I need the following to be explained, and anyone CC'ed in this email is free to provide input. Regarding the recusal procedures (this marks the third): The first recusal, you send me a modified version of my pleading as if I'm not going to notice it's missing the exhibits and affidavit critical to the motion. You confirm it was electronically filed when I bring this discrepancy up, and then suddenly change your answer when I bring up the file size discrepancy, and modify it again in conjunction

with an amended order of referral but that time split the file into three parts because of the "size of the motion" which directly contradicts how the filing procedure works, as per the Tarrant County District Clerk's FAQ. The parties agreed to continue the case because I had a dental emergency the day of the first hearing on November 7th, which everyone agreed to in writing, and which I appreciated. That was denied for a failure to appear. Because I read the Regional Judge's order, I waited for the next four months while the other side did absolutely nothing and reached out to you about an unopposed summary judgement that's been on the docket since February 22, 2024.

You12/13/25, 12:15 AM Gmail - FW: Myers 322-744263-23 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1842822989587015946&simpl=msg-f:1842822989587015... 2/5 ---

Page 3 --- told me to file a notice of hearing, which I already had when I filed the original motion, and reminded you that the judges hadn't been reinstated back into the case. Then, the next two recusals, you didn't attach any motion at all to the orders of referral, and erroneously included an order of referral for Judge Jeffrey Kaitcer not once, but now twice, when he wasn't implicated in either of the second or third motions. All three times I have no indication that the correct pleading was even sent to the Regional Presiding Judge, as the orders don't comport with what was filed, and we have judges electing not to recuse who were never asked to, and then orders denying motions which were never filed follow. The inconsistency surrounding a straightforward process set forth in the rules of procedure is being unnecessarily obfuscated, and there doesn't exist a logical explanation that warrants confusing a process designed to promote judicial fairness, transparency, and impartiality. As a final reminder, and in good faith to prevent any further disruption to the rule of law, these issues must be addressed or explained: 1. The most recent recusal brings up serious issues that undermine the judiciary, as I'm concurrently litigating in the Western District of Oklahoma trying to seek damages from this situation pursuant to RICO, and I warned the court that because I have no alternative options, and the Court insists on moving to final trial in the midst of all of these issues, I must enjoin additional defendants as the court found I was lacking continuity and relatedness. 2. The actions taken here provide the missing elements of the RICO claim according to the 10th Circuit, however, I will be appealing to the 10th circuit given there is a circuit split of authority regarding this aspect of RICO law. 3. I've given this Court many chances to provide corrective action, I've tried to warn the court that there's an ongoing criminal enterprise that was formed in December of 2023, yet it continues to ignore these unrebutted facts, and has now clearly chosen to become part of the enterprise I have repeatedly brought to the court's attention through several different vehicles, including mandamus petitions.

4. We can't even follow recusal procedures correctly, and for some reason you continue to be involved when nowhere in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure does it give you any designated role in this process. 6. You feel the need to email me these exchanges, when they should just be filed with the EFM. Nobody in this case requires emailed service, because the attorney on the other side is registered under the EFM, albeit to her prior employer, which is another issue the Court continues to ignore. Electronic filing is REQUIRED, it's not optional for licensed attorneys. 7. I've filed six mandamus and have received zero responses from any implicated judge, and

all the Court has to base its reasoning on is an order that claims consent with only one side of the case's signature on it. The only argument I've been given is that your position is to "help effectuate and expedite justice", yet here - no logical person knowing these facts would think for a second that the Court is being impartial, or that your involvement has done anything other than create ambiguities in a process designed to show the Court is, in fact, unbiased and fair. Again, I understand the bias is there - but you have to put yourself in my shoes, even if just for a moment, and realize that this entire time all I've done is try to WARN the court with facts that - to this day - remain unopposed within a record that exceeds 3,900 pages and exists in the public domain. <https://search.txcourts.gov/SearchMedia.aspx?>

MediaVersionID=8e2d45b4-fb4f-40a0-93bc-ed9ed5f3cebd&coa=cossup&DT=RECORD&MediaID=804ac8d3-9b5f-40b0-bc41-bbc08c814365 I don't want to litigate. I don't want to continue to try and explain what's already obvious. I want to get justice for my children, which is why instead of performing self-help remedies, I've tried to follow the law and give the court every opportunity that I possibly could to make them aware that it is actively assisting a criminal RICO enterprise in furthering their scheme, providing the continuity and relatedness elements that the Western District of Oklahoma found was lacking, and that will be appealed to the 10th circuit. I didn't ask to be in this position, I was put here, and I have no other options but to initiate a federal action and use the 3,900 page record and the unexplained misconduct as self-authenticating evidence that what I've been saying is the truth. 12/13/25, 12:15 AM Gmail - FW: Myers 322-744263-23 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1842822989587015946&simpl=msg-f:1842822989587015... 3/5 ---](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1842822989587015946&simpl=msg-f:1842822989587015...)

Page 4 --- This is nothing against you personally, Ms. Baker, I understand politics are at play here with next year's elections coming up - but this is my life - it has been destroyed, and I have to do everything that the law allows to ensure that this situation is remedied. In fact, I take nothing that has occurred personally, because I'm not doing any of this for any other reasons than it's what's best for my Children. I just can't fathom how the desire to silence a litigant could outweigh the risk of becoming involved with the criminal enterprise that has made absolutely no defense to the claims made against them, and they're being given a vehicle to just walk into court on December 10th and obtain a final decree of divorce despite all of these issues, thus effectively concluding the enterprise's affairs. This message is not meant to intimidate the Court, harass or threaten, but is to merely communicate what I have been forced into doing, and to reiterate the major issues that continue to compound. If anyone else were in my position, it's hard to fathom that they'd feel like they were being treated fairly. I hope that this Court, at the very least, understands why I have to do this. I've tried everything else to no avail, and every pleading has been in good faith. The opposing counsel, Petitioner, and CSD legal have been duly CC'ed in this email. A few more key notes: 1. Take special note how CSD legal is silent on the issue of their certificate of service sent in the intervention pleading containing mismatched names. Holly Hayes is allegedly the attorney of record, yet she signs with a signature that doesn't match any of the other 85 documents I've pulled containing Holly Hayes signature, and the signature line says "Choya Burkley". It's comically fraudulent. 2. Take special note how CSD legal has no basis to even be on the case considering they don't reply to

objections served to them, similar to opposing counsel here, and they're unable to enforce a facially void order, especially when the attorney on the other side can't file anything in her own name despite being allegedly retained in her individual capacity. 3. Take special note of how Holly Hayes, alleged attorney for the OAG, publicly left in 2018, claims to work at the SBA on her public LinkedIn profile, yet somehow is the attorney of record for the OAG in this case. 4. Take special note of how Cooper Carter, alleged attorney for Petitioner, publicly left Marx Altman and Joined Cantey Hanger in 2022, yet here she claims to be employed by Marx Altman with an EFM registered to Cantey Hanger, and has every filing submitted "on her behalf by Roderick Marx" who is not a party named in this suit. 5. Take special note how Cooper Carter will have zero explanation as to why her EFM account is registered to her prior employer despite this being brought to her attention time and time again, and won't have any explanation as to why she hasn't responded to anything served on her. 6. Take special note of the case docket, and notice that the Petitioner has only made one appearance in this matter on January 16, 2024, despite there being three alleged hearings. When you add in the document tampering, one-sided temporary orders, six ignored mandamus petitions, the sua sponte final trial setting, and the illegal and deceptive nature upon which this case was founded in conjunction with everything else mentioned above...it paints a very clear picture that defies all reasonable logic and warrants an immediate stay until these issues can be resolved. It makes no sense. Again, everything herein is not speculative, it's not accusatory - it's in the public domain, and remains unopposed.

What's stated here is already before the court, the only thing that doesn't exist is any substantive participation whatsoever by the other side or a reasonable explanation by the Court. This is not how this process is supposed to work, and everyone in this email chain knows it. I hope the Court starts to make the right decisions, because the real party responsible for this entire mess remains the Petitioner as the record facially establishes, and no further judicial resources should have to be expended in what should have already been a remedied situation by operation of law.12/13/25, 12:15 AM Gmail - FW: Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1842822989587015946&simpl=msg-f:1842822989587015>... 4/5 ---
Page 5 --- Charles Dustin Myers [Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:15 AM Gmail - FW: Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1842822989587015946&simpl=msg-f:1842822989587015>... 5/5
=====

FILE: Gmail - FW_ RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23
CL-12105.pdf
=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP FW: RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO.
322-744263-23 CL-12105 3 messages Cooper Carter Fri, Apr 4, 2025 at 2:20 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: FUDSTOP Ms. Lindsey, I'm available on the following dates for this hearing: April 22nd at 9:00 a.m. or 9:30 a.m. April 24th at 8:30 a.m. April 28th at 8:30 a.m. Thank you, Cooper L. Carter Attorney at Law Marx, Altman & Johnson 2905 Lackland Road Fort Worth, Texas 76116 Tel: (817) 926-6211 Fax: (817) 926-6188 THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION

THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA E-MAIL. THANK YOU.

12/13/25, 12:18 AM Gmail - FW: RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO.

322-744263-23 CL-12105 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828500972642879303&simpl=msg-f:1828500972642879... 1/5 ---](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828500972642879303&simpl=msg-f:1828500972642879...)

Page 2 --- From: Lindsey K. Baker [mailto:LKBaker@tarrantcountytexas.gov]

Sent: Friday, April 4, 2025 1:23 PM To: Cooper Carter Cc: 'Charlie Vids'

Subject: RE: RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105

The Motion to Consolidate will need to be formally set for a hearing before Judge Munford in the 322nd District Court. Below are available dates to set the Motion: Below are available dates to set the hearing: April 21st at 8:30 a.m. or 1:30 p.m. April 22nd at 9:00 a.m. or 9:30 a.m. April 23rd at 1:30 p.m. April 24th at 8:30 a.m. April 28th at 8:30 a.m. or 1:30 p.m. Please discuss your availability and let me know the date and time you agreed to. If a date and time cannot be agreed upon by noon on April 7th, the Court own its own will set the date. The Court must receive a Notice of Court Proceeding prior to formally setting the hearing. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-159712/13/25, 12:18 AM Gmail - FW: RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828500972642879303&simpl=msg-f:1828500972642879... 2/5 ---](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828500972642879303&simpl=msg-f:1828500972642879...)

Page 3 --- F r o m : Cooper Carter S e n t : Friday, April 4, 2025 12:38 PM T

o : Lindsey K. Baker C c : 'Charlie Vids' S u b j e c t : RE ITMOMO MYERS,

CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT! Think

Before You Click! Good Afternoon, Our office initially filed a Motion for Consolidation regarding the above referenced. Opposing party, during the pendency of this case, has filed a SAPCR in the 233rd Judicial District Court. What days would the Court be available to hearing this matter? I've cc-ed opposing party to this e-mail for convenience. Thank you, Cooper L. Carter Attorney at Law Marx, Altman & Johnson 2905 Lackland Road Fort Worth, Texas 76116 Tel: (817) 926-6211 Fax: (817) 926-6188 THIS

MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN 12/13/25, 12:18 AM Gmail - FW: RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828500972642879303&simpl=msg-f:1828500972642879... 3/5 ---](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828500972642879303&simpl=msg-f:1828500972642879...)

Page 4 --- ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA E-MAIL. THANK YOU. Lindsey K. Baker Fri, Apr 4, 2025 at 2:23 PM To: Cooper Carter Cc: FUDSTOP Thank you, Ms. Carter. I will wait until noon on Monday to see what date and time Mr. Myers is available. If you received a Notice of Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The Motion MUST be SET, HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO RETAIN. DO NOT EMAIL ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP. YOU MUST APPEAR IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING. All Orders that require the Judge's signature must be presented in person and will not be processed through e-filing. [Quoted text hidden] [Quoted text hidden] FUDSTOP Fri, Apr 4, 2025 at 2:59 PM To: Cooper Carter Cc: "Lindsey K. Baker" All, While I respect the Court's administrative responsibilities, I must again emphasize that these responsibilities include ensuring that proceedings are conducted within the bounds of jurisdiction and procedural law as well as improving justice and expediting the processing of cases through the courts. That isn't happening here. As a pro se litigant, I take seriously my duty to aid in the efficient administration of justice as I am held to the same standards as licensed attorneys. That includes timely raising jurisdictional objections, preserving the record, and preventing the court from engaging in proceedings that are void or wasteful.12/13/25, 12:18 AM Gmail - FW: RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828500972642879303&simpl=msg-f:1828500972642879...> 4/5 ---

Page 5 --- Setting a hearing on a motion that the court cannot lawfully decide—especially weeks in advance—undermines that purpose and risks wasting everyone's time and resources. I've acted in good faith to raise these concerns now, so that judicial time is not misallocated on a setting that cannot produce a valid result. To be clear: this Court lacks jurisdiction to consolidate a matter that is not pending before it. Setting a hearing on such a motion—absent any transfer of the SAPCR case from the 233rd District Court—is procedurally unsound and jurisdictionally improper. This concern is not theoretical; it is a statutory and constitutional defect that cannot be cured by scheduling preferences or delayed hearings. These objections have been raised repeatedly in the pleadings. Opposing counsel continues to ignore them and proceeds as if the jurisdictional prerequisite for consolidation has been met—it has not. Therefore, reiterating these issues is done to preserve the record to protect my rights. Even more troubling is the suggestion that this hearing be delayed until late April. The delay does nothing to resolve the threshold issue: this Court cannot lawfully entertain a motion concerning a case over which it has no authority. Setting such a hearing nearly a month out is not merely inefficient. Let me be clear: these are not legal arguments, these are statutory facts, and they are being restated here solely to: Preserve procedural objections, Clarify the record, and Prevent further waste of judicial resources. There is little justification for continued delay at this point—particularly considering that Ms. Carter previously moved to block emergency relief in the 233rd District Court without acknowledging these jurisdictional conflicts. If opposing counsel wishes to delay this hearing until late April, that is her prerogative. However, I respectfully state for the record that: I will not be providing availability for a hearing that is both procedurally and jurisdictionally

improper. Respectfully, Charles Dustin Myers Pro Se Respondent [Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:18 AM Gmail - FW: RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828500972642879303&simpl=msg-f:1828500972642879... 5/5

=====

FILE: Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105

(2).pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 11 messages Cooper Carter Wed, Apr 24, 2024 at 11:20 AM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Charlie Vids 12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1797233688031620525&simpl=msg-f:1797233688031620... 1/6 ---

Page 2 --- Good Morning, Our office filed a Motion for Pretrial Conference in the above referenced matter. Could you please list a few days that the Court is available for a pretrial conference? Opposing party is cc-ed for convenience. Thanks! Cooper L. Carter Attorney at Law Marx, Altman & Johnson 2905 Lackland Road Fort Worth, Texas 76116 Tel: (817) 926-6211 Fax: (817) 926-6188 THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA E-MAIL. THANK YOU. Lindsey K. Baker Wed, Apr 24, 2024 at 9:11 PM To: Cooper Carter Cc: Charlie Vids May 27, 28, 29, 30, 31. At 9:00 am, 9:30 am or 10:00 am. Get Outlook for iOS From : Cooper Carter Sent : Wednesday, April 24, 2024 11:20:08 AM12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1797233688031620525&simpl=msg-f:1797233688031620... 2/6 ---

Page 3 --- To : Lindsey K. Baker Cc : 'Charlie Vids' Subject : ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT!

Think Before You Click! [Quoted text hidden] Charlie Vids Wed, Apr 24, 2024 at 10:30 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Ms. Baker, I have filed an objection to this motion for pre-trial conference on the grounds of litigation that is still pending with the Second Court of Appeals under case No. 02-24-00149-CV. See envelope number 87035976. The objection is also grounded in the Tarrant County Family Law Local Rules, Rule 4.10(b) which requires certification by the moving party before any proceeding may be set, which was not present in the motion. For those reasons, and for judicial efficiency, I respectfully suggest we delay the pre-trial conference until the appeal is resolved and the procedural prerequisites are met, allowing for a proper briefing on the conference's merits. Respectfully, Charles Dustin Myers 6641

Anne Court Watauga, Texas 76148 chuckdustin12@gmail.com 817-507-6562 [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Thu, Apr 25, 2024 at 6:32 AM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter Mr. Myers: When you email the Court or respond to emails that the Court is included, you must "Reply All" to avoid Ex Parte Communication. I have included Ms. Carter in this email. The Court of Appeals matter was resolved and a ruling was sent out to all parties. Ms. Copper may request a Pre-Trial Conference to keep the case moving. You were included in her email to the Court to conference on your availability. Please respond by "Reply All" with your availability to the dates the Court has provided. Thank you. Get Outlook for iOS F r o m : Charlie Vids S e n t : Wednesday, April 24, 2024 10:30:33 PM T o : Lindsey K. Baker S u b j e c t : Re: ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 [Quoted text hidden] Cooper Carter Thu, Apr 25, 2024 at 9:21 AM To: Charlie Vids 12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1797233688031620525&simpl=msg-f:1797233688031620...> 3/6 ---

Page 4 --- Mr. Myers, I am available for a pretrial conference on May 27th at any time. Please let me know if you are available on that day. If I do not receive a response by tomorrow at 5:00 p.m., then please be aware that I will set this matter with the Court and tender this correspondence as proof of conference. Thank you, [Quoted text hidden] Charlie Vids Thu, Apr 25, 2024 at 9:23 AM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Cooper Carter Ms. Baker, There is a pending rehearing motion in the Court of appeals filed 04.18.24 pending a decision. No certificate of conference was required pursuant to Tex. R. App. 49.12. Further, local rule 4.10(b) must be followed before a proceeding may be set. Respectfully, Charles Myers Chuckdustin12@gmail.com 817-506-6562 [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Thu, Apr 25, 2024 at 11:37 AM To: Charlie Vids Cc: Cooper Carter The trial Court was not aware of a Motion for Rehearing. A copy has not been filed with the 322nd Court, as of today. However, I did look up the COA No. 02-24-00149-CV and verified that the Motion for Rehearing that you are referring to was filed on April 18, 2024. At this time, I will take no action on setting Petitioner's Motion for Pre-Trial Conference. If you received a Notice of Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The Motion MUST be SET, HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO RETAIN. 12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1797233688031620525&simpl=msg-f:1797233688031620...> 4/6 ---

Page 5 --- DO NOT EMAIL ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP. YOU MUST APPEAR IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING. All Orders that require the Judge's signature must be presented in person and will not be processed through e-filing. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 [Quoted text hidden] Charlie Vids Thu, Apr 25, 2024 at 7:38 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Cooper Carter Ms. Baker, I am reaching out regarding updates from the appellate court. The decision of the appellate court came back this evening and was what I anticipated. I've already begun drafting and will be filing for a Petition for Writ of Certiorari in the Texas Supreme Court, and will have it submitted by Friday, May 10th. Thank you for your time. Respectfully, Charles Myers Chuckdustin12@gmail.com 817-507-6562 [Quoted text

hidden] Charlie Vids Thu, Apr 25, 2024 at 8:14 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" 12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f: 1797233688031620525&simpl=msg-f:1797233688031620... 5/6 ---

Page 6 --- Ms. Baker, Regarding the earlier message regarding the Certiorari - the State equivalent would be the Petition for Review. I'm happy to discuss the merits for any potential hearing in the trial court with Ms. Carter at her convenience Have a good evening. Respectfully, Charles Dustin Myers Chuckdustin12@gmail.com 817-507-6562 [Quoted text hidden] Cooper Carter Fri, Apr 26, 2024 at 12:09 PM To: Charlie Vids , "Lindsey K. Baker" Mr. Myers and Ms. Lindsey, Lindsey, based on the denial of the appellate court, would we be able to get a pretrial hearing scheduled to move the case along? Or would you prefer to wait? Mr. Myers, if Lindsey is in agreement with setting this case for a pretrial hearing, what dates listed below are you available? Thank you, [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Fri, Apr 26, 2024 at 1:06 PM To: Cooper Carter , Charlie Vids I am out of the office this afternoon. Please follow up next week. Get Outlook for iOS F r o m : Cooper Carter S e n t : Friday, April 26, 2024 12:09:43 PM T o : 'Charlie Vids' ; Lindsey K. Baker S u b j e c t : RE: ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO.

322-744263-23 CL-12105 [Quoted text hidden] 12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f: 1797233688031620525&simpl=msg-f:1797233688031620... 6/6

=====FILE: Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105.pdf=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 8 messages Cooper Carter Wed, Sep 4, 2024 at 1:15 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Charlie Vids Good Afternoon Lindsey, Our office had filed a motion for pretrial conference a while back ago. Mr. Myers had filed a Writ of Mandamus which halted our case in the trial court. The Texas Supreme Court has since denied Mr. Myers's Writ of Mandamus regarding this matter. We would like to schedule a pretrial conference at this time. Could you please provide some dates that the Court is available to hear this matter? Mr. Myers has been cc-ed to this e-mail for convenience. Thanks!

Cooper L. Carter Attorney at Law Marx, Altman & Johnson 2905 Lackland Road Fort Worth, Texas 76116 Tel: (817) 926-6211 Fax: (817) 926-6188 THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA E-MAIL. THANK YOU. 12/13/25, 12:21 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:

1809290348182285880&simpl=msg-f:1809290348182285... 1/6 ---
Page 2 --- Lindsey K. Baker Wed, Sep 4, 2024 at 2:01 PM To: Cooper Carter
Cc: Charlie Vids Below are available dates to set the Pre-Trial Conference:
Sept 11, 12, 17, 18, 24, 27, 30. At 9:00 a.m., 9:30 a.m. or 10:00 a.m. If you
received a Notice of Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The
Motion MUST be SET, HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO
RETAIN. DO NOT EMAIL ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP.
 YOU MUST APPEAR IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING.
 All Orders that require the Judge's signature must be presented in
person and will not be processed through e-filing. Lindsey Baker 322nd
Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford,
4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 12/13/25, 12:21
AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1809290348182285880&simpl=msg-f:1809290348182285... 2/6 ---
Page 3 --- F r o m : Cooper Carter S e n t : Wednesday, September 4, 2024
1:16 PM T o : Lindsey K. Baker C c : 'Charlie Vids' S u b j e c t : ITMOMO
MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT!
Think Before You Click! [Quoted text hidden] Charlie Vids Wed, Sep 4, 2024
at 2:28 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" , Cooper Carter Ms. Carter, Thank you for
your email and for including me in the discussion regarding the pretrial
conference. I would like to inform you that I plan on filing a motion for
rehearing with the Texas Supreme Court concerning the Writ of Mandamus,
with a filing deadline of September 16, 2024. Given the significance of this
pending motion, I believe it is in the best interest of both parties to delay
scheduling any pretrial conference until the rehearing has been resolved.
Please see <https://search.txcourts.gov/Case.aspx>?

cn=24-0395&coa=cossup Additionally, I have not yet been briefed on
the merits of the pretrial conference. As you are aware, according to the
Tarrant County Local Rules, specifically Rule 10 on Motion Practice, all
parties are directed to use all reasonable means to resolve pretrial disputes
to avoid the necessity of judicial intervention. Furthermore, no court
proceeding should be set unless the moving party has certified in a motion
or letter that a conference has been held on the merits of the motion, and
that a reasonable effort to resolve the dispute without court intervention has
been made but failed. Alternatively, if a conference was not held, the reasons
for this must be detailed. To date, I have not received the necessary
information to understand the purpose and merits of the proposed pretrial
conference. Proceeding with scheduling at this time would be premature
and improper. The motion for rehearing will be properly served upon its
submission to the Texas Supreme Court as required by the Texas Rules of
Civil Procedure. Upon resolution of the rehearing, I will be more than happy
to discuss the merits of any pretrial conference moving forward and have a
date set accordingly. Respectfully, Charles Myers chuckdustin12@gmail.com
817-507-6562 [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Wed, Sep 4, 2024 at
3:54 PM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter If hearing date for the Pre-Trial
Conference cannot be agreed upon prior to September 5th at 12:00 p.m.,
the Court on its own will set the Pre-Trial Conference on one of the dates
that was provided to you. For reference, the dates the Court is available for
the Pre-Trial Conference are below:12/13/25, 12:21 AM Gmail - ITMOMO
MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/>

u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1809290348182285880&simpl=msg-f:1809290348182285... 3/6 ---
Page 4 --- Sept 11, 12, 17, 18, 24, 27, 30. At 9:00 a.m., 9:30 a.m. or 10:00 a.m. Thank you. [Quoted text hidden] Cooper Carter Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 8:29 AM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" , Charlie Vids Good Morning All, I am available for a pretrial conference regarding this matter on the following dates and times: Sept. 11, 24, 18 at 9:30 a.m. or 10:00 a.m. Thank you! Cooper L. Carter Attorney at Law Marx, Altman & Johnson 2905 Lackland Road Fort Worth, Texas 76116 Tel: (817) 926-6211 Fax: (817) 926-6188 THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA E-MAIL. THANK YOU. [Quoted text hidden] Charlie Vids Thu, Sep 5, 2024 at 11:58 AM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" , Cooper Carter 12/13/25, 12:21 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO.

322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?>

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1809290348182285880&simpl=msg-f:1809290348182285... 4/6 ---
Page 5 --- To all, I am writing to formally and unequivocally object to the scheduling of a pretrial conference at this time for the following compelling reasons: Immediate Legal Deadline: I am currently facing a critical deadline on September 16th related to an ongoing appeal before the Texas Supreme Court. The outcome of this appeal directly impacts the temporary residency issue and other significant aspects of this case. Scheduling a pretrial conference before this matter is resolved would be not only premature but also prejudicial to my ability to effectively participate in the proceedings. I have a right to a re-hearing which I am choosing to pursue at this time. Ongoing Harm from Temporary Orders: The temporary orders currently in place continue to inflict significant and ongoing financial harm. It is imperative that these issues be addressed before any pretrial conference is scheduled. Proceeding without resolving these matters would be an exercise in futility and could exacerbate the harm already being caused. Failure to Serve the Texas OAG: The Texas Attorney General's office, having intervened in this case and being docketed as a party in this matter as indicated on the re:SearchTX platform, and formally requested discovery, has not been properly served with the necessary information regarding this pretrial conference. Proceeding with a pretrial conference without their inclusion is not only procedurally improper but also a clear violation of due process. Basic Discovery Not Completed The purpose of the pre-trial conference is rendered meaningless without basic discovery being completed and without clear reasoning as required. Non-Compliance with Local Court Rules: Local court rules, specifically the requirement for a certificate of conference, have not been adhered to. These procedural safeguards are in place to ensure fairness and transparency in the legal

process, and they cannot be bypassed or waived without proper justification. Scheduling a pretrial conference under these circumstances would violate these fundamental procedural requirements and render any subsequent proceedings flawed. Uncertain Temporary Residency: I am in the midst of securing another temporary residency as my current arrangement expires on September 14th. This immediate and pressing concern further complicates my ability to participate meaningfully in any pretrial conference scheduled at this time. Given these substantial and unresolved issues, the dates provided for the pretrial conference are untenable as notwithstanding the procedural defects and noncompliance with local rules, attending such a conference at the available times would not be possible. Should a pretrial conference be scheduled despite these serious objections, I will be compelled to formally object on the record and explore all available legal remedies to protect my rights and ensure compliance with legal procedures and due process requirements. I respectfully but firmly request that the pretrial conference be postponed until these matters are adequately resolved, including the outcome of the pending appeal, proper service of all parties with a specific purpose pertaining to the conference, and adherence to all procedural requirements in the interest of judicial economy and fairness to all parties in the case. Sincerely, Charles Dustin Myers

chuckdustin12@gmail.com [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at 1:27 PM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter A Status Conference with Judge Munford will be set on September 24, 2024, at 8:30 a.m. The purpose of the conference is to update the Court on the status of the case and to determine when a Pre-Trial Conference should be set.12/13/25, 12:21 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1809290348182285880&simpl=msg-f:1809290348182285... 5/6 ---

Page 6 --- This email is your formal notice of the Status Conference on September 24, 2024, at 8:30 a.m. The conference will be in person, in the 322nd District Court, 4th floor. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 From: Charlie Vids Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2024 11:58 AM [Quoted text hidden] [Quoted text hidden] Charlie Vids Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at 1:29 PM Draft To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Lindsey, [Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:21 AM Gmail - ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1809290348182285880&simpl=msg-f:1809290348182285... 6/6

=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (10).pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 1 message Lindsey K. Baker Mon, Nov 11, 2024 at 12:32 PM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter , "CSD-legal- 914@oag.texas.gov" , "CSD-legal-914@texasattorneygeneral.gov" Attached is an Order Denying Joint Motion to Recuse. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 322-744263-23 MYERS-Order Denying Joint Motion to Recuse.pdf 66K 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/>

mail/u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1815451995077799402&simpl=msg-f:1815451995077799... 1/1
=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (11).pdf
=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 2 messages Lindsey K. Baker
Thu, Oct 10, 2024 at 11:17 AM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter Attached
please find correspondence from Judge Kaitcer and an Order of Referral.
Due to the length of the Joint Motion to Recuse, it is being sent as three
attachments. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant
County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas
76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 4 attachments Correspondence.pdf 31K Order
of Referral-Part 1.pdf 1735K Myers- Part 2.pdf 2070K Myers-Part 3.pdf
3477K Charlie Vids Thu, Oct 10, 2024 at 11:58 AM Draft To: "Lindsey K.
Baker" 12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?
=====

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1812544413484334450&simpl=msg-f:1812544413484334... 1/2 ---

Page 2 --- Ms. Baker, I appreciate your communication regarding these
matter However, I would like some clarification as to why the motion was
altered from its original state, and why it is missing from the case docket?
[Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:20 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23
<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?
=====

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1812544413484334450&simpl=msg-f:1812544413484334... 2/2
=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (13).pdf
=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 4 messages Lindsey K. Baker
Tue, Oct 8, 2024 at 4:42 PM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter , "CSD-legal-
914@oag.texas.gov" Attached for your records please find correspondence
from Judge Munford to Judge Evans and an Order of Referral. Thank you.
Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center
200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817)
884-1597 2 attachments Correspondence.pdf 33K Myers-Order of
Referral.pdf 1096K Charlie Vids Tue, Oct 8, 2024 at 6:29 PM To: "Lindsey K.
Baker" Dear Lindsay Baker, I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to
inform you that my Motion to Recuse, referenced in your message, may have
been forwarded without the attached exhibits and affidavits that are critical
to the motion. The exhibits and affidavits provide necessary evidence and
support for my claims, and it is important that the court has access to the
full record. Could you please confirm whether these documents were
received with my motion? It raises further concern that they are missing.
Please let me know the appropriate process to ensure that these documents
are added to the court's record. Thank you for your attention to this matter.
12/13/25, 12:21 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?
=====

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1812383694660264938&simpl=msg-f:1812383694660264... 1/3 ---

Page 2 --- I have attached a copy that was submitted and is available for
download via the re-search Texas platform, which differs from the document
=====

attached in your prior email as it does not contain the relevant exhibits. Please inform as soon as possible. Best regards, Charles Myers Chuckdustin12@gmail.com [Quoted text hidden] JOINT MOTION TO RECUSE (8).pdf 19741K Lindsey K. Baker Tue, Oct 8, 2024 at 10:43 PM To: Charlie Vids The exhibits were e-filed and are included in the Courts file. If you received a Notice of Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The Motion MUST be SET, HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO RETAIN. DO NOT EMAIL ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP. YOU MUST APPEAR IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING. All Orders that require the Judge's signature must be presented in person and will not be processed through e-filing. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 7619612/13/25, 12:21 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1812383694660264938&simpl=msg-f:1812383694660264... 2/3 ---
Page 3 --- Phone: (817) 884-1597 From: Charlie Vids Sent: Tuesday, October 8, 2024 6:29 PM To: Lindsey K. Baker Subject: Re: Myers 322-744263-23 EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT! Think Before You Click! [Quoted text hidden]
Charlie Vids Wed, Oct 9, 2024 at 12:06 AM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Dear Ms. Baker, Thank you for your response, and would just ask for some clarification on a couple of things. There are noticeable discrepancies between the file I submitted, accepted and available on the reSearchTX platform versus what appears in the court's receipt to the Regional Judge. My original submission was 20.21 MB, while the version in the courts email is 423 KB. Additionally, my receipt provides no indication that the exhibits were filed alongside the motion, particularly the affidavit, which is referenced in the table of contents. The document I submitted was also hyperlinked, but those links are missing in the court's receipt. Could you please clarify which court system the file is currently in and explain for what purpose the file was modified to appear as if it were an unverified motion? I would appreciate your prompt attention to this matter at your earliest convenience. Best regards, Charles Myers Chuckdustin12@gmail.com [Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:21 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1812383694660264938&simpl=msg-f:1812383694660264... 3/3
=====FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (14).pdf=====
--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 3 messages Lindsey K. Baker Mon, Feb 12, 2024 at 1:34 PM To: "chuckdustin12@gmail.com" , Cooper Carter The Court received a Motion for Reconsideration and to Vacate Temporary Orders from Respondent. Below are dates that the Court is available to set the hearing: Feb 27, 28, 29. March 1, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20. At 9:00 a.m., 9:30 a.m. or 10:00 a.m. Mr. Myers you will need to conference with Ms. Carter or her office to discuss availability. Once you both have agreed to a date and time, please email me and I will set the hearing. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 Charlie Vids Thu, Feb 15, 2024 at 9:59 AM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Lindsey, Ms. Carter informed that March 14th would be her only availability

regarding the hearing. Best Regards, 12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1790722938319425713&simpl=msg-f:1790722938319425... 1/3 ---](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1790722938319425713&simpl=msg-f:1790722938319425...)
Page 2 --- Charles Myers chuckdustin12@gmail.com 817-507-6562 [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Thu, Feb 15, 2024 at 12:05 PM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter Attached is the executed Notice of Hearing. If you received a Notice of Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The Motion MUST be SET, HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO RETAIN. DO NOT EMAIL ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP. YOU MUST APPEAR IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING. All Orders that require the Judge's signature must be presented in person and will not be processed through e-filing. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 From: Charlie Vids Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2024 10:00 AM 12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1790722938319425713&simpl=msg-f:1790722938319425... 2/3 ---](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1790722938319425713&simpl=msg-f:1790722938319425...)

Page 3 --- To: Lindsey K. Baker Subject: Re: Myers 322-744263-23 EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT! Think Before You Click! [Quoted text hidden] Myers.pdf 358K 12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1790722938319425713&simpl=msg-f:1790722938319425... 3/3 =====](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1790722938319425713&simpl=msg-f:1790722938319425...)

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (2).pdf =====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 2 messages Lindsey K. Baker Tue, Oct 14, 2025 at 12:52 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , "CSD-LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Attached is an Order Declaring Notice of Intent to File Tertiary Motion of Recusal Moot. Thank you, Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 Order Declaring Notice of Intent to File Tertiary Mot of Recusal Moot.pdf 442K FUDSTOP Tue, Oct 14, 2025 at 7:57 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Lindsey, This doesn't even make sense. Why would the Regional Judge deny a notice of intent as if it were a motion? The title is correct in declaring the notice as moot, but then it goes on to deny the notice as if it were a recusal motion. More importantly, why did Judge Munford forward a notice in the first place? Denying a notice isn't even legally comprehensible to begin with. Under Texas law, a "notice of intent" is not a motion or pleading and therefore is not subject to denial by the court; the proper judicial response is to acknowledge the notice or, if relevant, address the underlying motion, not the notice itself. The court's order "denying" a notice of intent lacks a legal basis because such notices are not applications for relief. 12/13/25, 12:15 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1845980648320809440&simpl=msg-f:1845980648320809... 1/2 ---](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1845980648320809440&simpl=msg-f:1845980648320809...)

Page 2 --- Judicial orders should reflect the nature of the filings before the court. Issuing an order "denying" a notice of intent is procedurally irregular

because it purports to rule on a filing that does not seek any relief. Such an order may create confusion about the status of the underlying matter and the court's reasoning. The proper practice is for the court to address only those filings that require a judicial decision—namely, motions and, where appropriate, pleadings. Also, the order claims the Judge denied a single motion on September 24, 2025 when he denied two motions which were never filed. The continuous inconsistency is alarming, and this entire process is comically fraudulent. The law isn't optional, and all of these issues are being duly documented for future litigation. Unfortunately, quasi judicial immunity and judicial immunity will not protect you, Judge Munford, Judge Kaitcer, or Cooper Carter from liability, as everything that occurred after January 16, 2024, in this matter is void for lack of subject matter jurisdiction as Judge Munford never signed the required order of referral before handing the case off to Judge Kaitcer. Also - Cooper L. Carter has been representing the Petitioner in this matter without authority. Furthermore, altering an official government record (such as the recusal motions filed) is not a judicial act, it's administrative, was done outside of the presence of the parties, and constitutes a predicate act under RICO because these altered documents relied on interstate wires. I'm done playing these games with the Court. I've given the Court every possible legal avenue to correct the issues within this case, but it's clear we aren't even taking a cursory review of the pleadings that are being filed. I find it hard to believe that David Evans has been involved in these proceedings. It's perplexing that a judge with his experience would continue to make these mistakes that defy all logic and common sense... such as ruling on motions that were never filed, incorrectly stating the party names, and now denying a notice. The only common thread between these recurring issues in these recusal proceedings is your involvement in a process that does not concern you. The Court, by continuing to allow the criminals on the other side to subvert the rule of law, is creating a public safety risk by condoning this behavior. Finally, the RICO suit will be filed in the Western District of Oklahoma, not here. This message is sent in good faith. I'm simply trying to follow the law and protect the best interests of my Children. The suit is being brought because I have no other remedies. The feelings towards me are irrelevant. The law is what matters. If you were in my shoes, you'd have the same concerns. I hold nothing against you personally. I just seek a fair process. So far, that has not been the case, as the record facially demonstrates. I hope you can understand my point of view. Have a good evening, Charlie [Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:15 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1845980648320809440&simpl=msg-f:1845980648320809... 2/2](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1845980648320809440&simpl=msg-f:1845980648320809...)

=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (4).pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 1 message Lindsey K. Baker
Fri, Aug 29, 2025 at 10:27 AM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , CSD-Legal-914 , "CSD-LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Attached is a copy of correspondence from Judge Munford to Judge Evans and an Order of Referral. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 2 attachments Correspondence.pdf 493K Order of Referral.pdf 31K 12/13/25, 12:16 AM Gmail - Myers

322-744263-23 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1841804083462425349&simpl=msg-f:1841804083462425... 1/1
=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (5).pdf
=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 1 message Lindsey K. Baker
Fri, Aug 15, 2025 at 1:13 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , CSD-
Legal-914 , "CSD-LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Attached
please find a Notice Setting a Court Proceeding and Docket Control Order.
Final Trial is set for December 10, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. in the 322nd District
Court. This is an in person setting and your presence is required. Thank you.
Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center
200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817)
884-1597 Myers.pdf 135K 12/13/25, 12:16 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23
<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?>
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1840546198747874840&simpl=msg-f:1840546198747874... 1/1
=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (6).pdf
=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 1 message Lindsey K. Baker
Mon, May 19, 2025 at 3:50 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , "CSD-
LEGAL- 914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Attached is an Order
Summarily Denying Motion for Recusal as to Judge Munford and an Order
Summarily Denying Motion for Recusal as to Judge Kaitcer in the above-
referenced case. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant
County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas
76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 2 attachments 322-744263-23 Myers - Order
Summarily Denying Motion for Recusal as to Judge Munford.pdf 395K
322-744263-23 Myers - Order Summarily Denying Motion for Recusal as to
Judge Kaitcer.pdf 337K 12/13/25, 12:16 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23
<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?>
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1832583519959359866&simpl=msg-f:1832583519959359... 1/1
=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (7).pdf
=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 1 message Lindsey K. Baker
Fri, May 16, 2025 at 10:52 AM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , "CSD-LEGAL-
914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Attached is an Order Denying
Objection to Order of Assignment Dated May 6, 2025, and the Objection
Dated April 29, 2025, in the above-referenced case. Thank you. Lindsey
Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E.
Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597
Myers-Order Denying Objection to Order of Assignment and Objection.pdf
309K 12/13/25, 12:16 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?>
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1832292968532256046&simpl=msg-f:1832292968532256... 1/1
=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (8).pdf
=====

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 1 message Lindsey K. Baker
Tue, Apr 29, 2025 at 2:44 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , CSD-Legal-914 , "CSD-LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Attached is correspondence from Judge Munford to Judge Evans and an Order of Referral on Motion to Recuse and First Amended Motion to Recuse. Further attached is correspondence from Judge Kaitcer to Judge Evans and an Order of Referral on Motion to Recuse and First Amended Motion to Recuse.
Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 4 attachments Correspondence-District.pdf 329K Order of Referral-District.pdf 338K Correspondence-Associate.pdf 38K Order of Referral-Associate.pdf 322K 12/13/25, 12:17 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1830767436361939345&simpl=msg-f:1830767436361939... 1/1](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1830767436361939345&simpl=msg-f:1830767436361939...)

=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 (9).pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 2 messages Lindsey K. Baker
Tue, Apr 22, 2025 at 4:39 PM To: Charlie Vids , Cooper Carter , "CSD-legal-914@texasattorneygeneral.gov" Attached is a Notice Setting a Court Proceeding for April 29, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. in the 322nd District Court, 4th floor. Thank you. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 Myers-NOCP.pdf 369K FUDSTOP Tue, Apr 22, 2025 at 4:43 PM Draft To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Cooper Carter , CSD-legal-914@texasattorneygeneral.gov Lindsey, I will be chaperoning at a school field trip that day for Grace Hardemean Elementary School all day and will be unable to attend. [Quoted text hidden] 12/13/25, 12:18 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 [https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1830140506062185925&simpl=msg-f:1830140506062185... 1/1](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1830140506062185925&simpl=msg-f:1830140506062185...)

=====

FILE: Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23.pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Myers 322-744263-23 1 message Lindsey K. Baker
Fri, Nov 7, 2025 at 12:57 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter , "CSD-LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Attached is a Notice Setting a Cort Proceeding for Summary Judgment. The hearing will be in person on December 2, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. Thank you, Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 Myers-NOCP.pdf 47K 12/13/25, 12:15 AM Gmail - Myers 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1848159116229857644&simpl=msg-f:18481591162298576441/1>

=====

FILE: Gmail - Out of Office.pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Out of Office 1 message Lindsey K. Baker Thu, Nov 7, 2024 at 8:17 AM To: Charlie Vids I am out of the office with COVID. The

Auxiliary Coordinator, Tegan is on vacation this week, No one is covering. I am trying my best to respond to emergency emails. If you do not have an EMERGENCY, please email me back on Monday for settings. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - Out of Office https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1815073555947654732&simpl=msg-f:1815073555947654... 1/1
=====

FILE: Gmail - RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23
CL-12105.pdf
=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23
CL-12105 6 messages Cooper Carter Fri, Apr 4, 2025 at 12:37 PM To:
"Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Charlie Vids Good Afternoon, Our office initially filed a Motion for Consolidation regarding the above referenced. Opposing party, during the pendency of this case, has filed a SAPCR in the 233rd Judicial District Court. What days would the Court be available to hearing this matter? I've cc-ed opposing party to this e-mail for convenience. Thank you, Cooper L. Carter Attorney at Law Marx, Altman & Johnson 2905 Lackland Road Fort Worth, Texas 76116 Tel: (817) 926-6211 Fax: (817) 926-6188 THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA E-MAIL. THANK YOU. 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828494531529664197&simpl=msg-f:1828494531529664... 1/5 ---

Page 2 --- FUDSTOP Fri, Apr 4, 2025 at 12:54 PM To: Cooper Carter , "Lindsey K. Baker" Hello, Thanks for the update. However, it would be procedurally improper to set a matter for hearing given noncompliance with 237a Tex. R. CIV. P by Petitioner. Also, the consolidation motion is moot as a crucial step in this process was not followed by opposing counsel. The Texas Family Code requires a suit to be transferred prior to any consolidation taking place. No such transfer has been filed, so any attempt at consolidation is improper before the prerequisite requirement is met pursuant to Tex. R. Civ. P. 6.407(b), which is the statute i assume she is invoking here. For these reasons, it would be more appropriate to set the matter for hearing on the DWOP filed and served back in January given the lack of prosecution until now. That way, no further unnecessary delays occur and the children get the unopposed relief they've been needing. Thank you, Charles Dustin Myers 817-546-3693 [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Fri, Apr 4, 2025 at 1:23 PM To: Cooper Carter Cc: Charlie Vids The Motion to Consolidate will need to be formally set for a hearing before Judge Munford in the 322nd District Court. Below are available dates to set the Motion: Below are available dates to set the hearing: April 21st at 8:30 a.m.

or 1:30 p.m. April 22nd at 9:00 a.m. or 9:30 a.m. April 23rd at 1:30 p.m. April 24th at 8:30 a.m. April 28th at 8:30 a.m. or 1:30 p.m. 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828494531529664197&simpl=msg-f:1828494531529664... 2/5 ---

Page 3 --- Please discuss your availability and let me know the date and time you agreed to. If a date and time cannot be agreed upon by noon on April 7th, the Court own its own will set the date. The Court must receive a Notice of Court Proceeding prior to formally setting the hearing. Thank you.

Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 F r o m : Cooper Carter S e n t : Friday, April 4, 2025 12:38 PM T o : Lindsey K. Baker C c : 'Charlie Vids' S u b j e c t : RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT! Think Before You Click! [Quoted text hidden] FUDSTOP Fri, Apr 4, 2025 at 1:28 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" , Cooper Carter Lindsey, I'm unsure if you've received my last email, but the transfer motion cannot just be skipped, and I had requested a hearing for the DWOP prior to this improper request for a consolidation. Please refer to Texas Family Code 6.407. Not sure what purpose a hearing on the consolidation would serve granted it's premature and doesn't comport with Texas Procedure other than to have it summarily denied as a matter of law, which also seems to defeat the need for a hearing. I'm available at the court's earliest convenience for a hearing on the DWOP. If the Court insists on a consolidation hearing despite it being procedurally premature, I would like to request we also hear the pending DWOP concurrently in the interest of judicial economy. 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828494531529664197&simpl=msg-f:1828494531529664... 3/5 ---

Page 4 --- Thank you, Charles Dustin Myers [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Fri, Apr 4, 2025 at 1:57 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter Mr. Myers: Your arguments and objections are to be presented to the Court in person at the time of the hearing. Therefore, please do not quote the Law to me in your emails. As a Court Coordinator, my duties and responsibilities are to schedule matters before the Court after the proper documents have been filed with the District Clerk. Furthermore, if you are seeking relief from the Court, you must E-File a Notice of Court Proceeding and request hearing dates on your Motion. Your requested relief and Ms. Carter's Motion to Consolidate can be set on the same date and time once you have complied. As previously mentioned, if a date cannot be agreed upon by noon on April 7, 2025, The Court own its own will set hearing. Thank you. If you received a Notice of Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The Motion MUST be SET, HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO RETAIN. DO NOT EMAIL ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP. YOU MUST APPEAR IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING. All Orders that require the Judge's signature must be presented in person and will not be processed through e-filing. [Quoted text hidden] [Quoted text hidden] FUDSTOP Sat, Dec 13, 2025 at 12:19 AM 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO. 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828494531529664197&simpl=msg-f:1828494531529664... 4/5 ---

Page 5 --- Draft To: "Lindsey K. Baker" , Cooper Carter [Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - RE ITMOMO MYERS, CAUSE NO.

322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1828494531529664197&simpl=msg-f:1828494531529664... 5/5

=====

FILE: Gmail - RE_ Myers 322-744263-23 CL-12105.pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP RE: Myers 322-744263-23 CL-12105 2 messages
Cooper Carter Mon, Nov 17, 2025 at 4:30 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" ,
FUDSTOP , "CSD-LEGAL- 914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Cc:
Cooper Carter Good Afternoon, I saw where this case has been set for
December 2, 2025 at 1:30 p.m. for a hearing. I am in final trial that day and
time in Denton County and will not be able to attend a hearing regarding
this matter at that day or time. Thank you, Cooper L. Carter Attorney at Law
Marx, Altman & Johnson 2905 Lackland Road Fort Worth, Texas 76116
Tel: (817) 926-6211 Fax: (817) 926-6188 THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED
ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS
ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS
MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR
AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE
INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY
DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED
THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY
BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO
US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA E-MAIL. THANK YOU.

From: Victoria Weaver [mailto:victoriaweaver@majadmin.com] Sent: Monday, November 10, 2025 10:39 AM 12/13/25, 12:14 AM Gmail - RE: Myers 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1848422176211765899&simpl=msg-f:18490784270937941... 1/4 ---

Page 2 --- To: 'Lindsey K. Baker'; 'FUDSTOP'; 'CSD-
LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV' Subject: RE: Myers
322-744263-23 CL-12105 Lindsey, Cooper has a Final Trial in Denton at that
time. Are there any other available dates? Sincerely, Victoria P. Weaver,
Attorney at Law Co-Counsel Marx, Altman & Johnson 2905 Lackland
Road Fort Worth, Texas 76116 Tel: (817) 926-6211 Fax: (817) 926-6188 THIS
MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR
ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION
THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW.
IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT
OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE
MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED
THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED
THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY
BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US
AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA E-MAIL. THANK YOU.

From: Lindsey K. Baker [mailto:LKBaker@tarrantcountytexas.gov] Sent: Friday, November 7, 2025 12:58 PM To: FUDSTOP; Cooper Carter; 'CSD-

LEGAL-914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV' Subject: Myers
322-744263-23 CL-12105 Attached is a Notice Setting a Cort Proceeding for Summary Judgment. The hearing will be in person on December 2, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. 12/13/25, 12:14 AM Gmail - RE: Myers 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1848422176211765899&simpl=msg-f:18490784270937941... 2/4 ---

Page 3 --- Thank you, Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 Lindsey K. Baker Mon, Nov 17, 2025 at 4:33 PM To: Cooper Carter , FUDSTOP , "CSD-LEGAL-

914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV" Cc: Cooper Carter The hearing will remain set on December 2, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. Thank you, Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E.

Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 From : Cooper Carter Sent : Monday, November 17, 2025 4:30 PM To : Lindsey K. Baker ; 'FUDSTOP' ; 'CSD-LEGAL-

914@TEXASATTORNEYGENERAL.GOV' Cc : 'Cooper Carter' Subject : RE: Myers 322-744263-23 CL-12105 12/13/25, 12:14 AM Gmail - RE: Myers 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1848422176211765899&simpl=msg-f:18490784270937941... 3/4 ---

Page 4 --- EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT! Think Before You Click! [Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:14 AM Gmail - RE: Myers 322-744263-23 CL-12105 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:
1848422176211765899&simpl=msg-f:18490784270937941... 4/4

=====

FILE: Gmail - Ruling Requested - Unopposed Summary Judgment (Filed 2_22_2024) - Case No. 322-744263-23.pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Ruling Requested - Unopposed Summary Judgment (Filed 2/22/2024) - Case No. 322-744263-23 9 messages FUDSTOP Fri, Mar 14, 2025 at 4:47 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" , Cooper Carter Ms. Baker, My Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, filed February 22, 2024, remains unopposed for over a year. Under TRCP 166a(c) and Local Rule 4.01(d), this motion is ripe for ruling. Opposing counsel's failure to respond waives any objection. Further, opposing counsel (CC'ed here), cannot prosecute her case in accordance with Texas law, and still has an outstanding rule 12 motion that is now also unopposed. A granting of either motion would resolve the core case issues, and given the circumstances, is duly warranted. I formally request an immediate ruling or confirmation of when the Court will act. Further delay is unacceptable. If the judges cannot legally act given opposing counsels failure to comply with Tex. R. CIV. P. 237a, then the matter should be brought before David L. Evans without delay. Sincerely, Charles Dustin Myers Chuckdustin12@gmail.com 817-546-3693 Lindsey K. Baker Sun, Mar 16, 2025 at 1:54 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter Cc: "chuckdustin12@gmail.com" Mr. Dustin: Prior to providing available dates to set your hearing request, the Court must know how much time you are requesting for the hearing? Further, you must E-file or personally appear with a Notice of Hearing for the Court to set the hearing. Thank you, If you received a Notice of Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The

Motion MUST be SET, HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO RETAIN. 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - Ruling Requested - Unopposed Summary Judgment (Filed 2/22/2024) - Case No. 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-a:r1662214371576409810&simpl=msg-a:r-84576847325354... 1/5 ---
Page 2 --- DO NOT EMAIL ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP.
 YOU MUST APPEAR IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING.
 All Orders that require the Judge's signature must be presented in person and will not be processed through e-filing. Lindsey Baker 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200 E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597 F r o m :
FUDSTOP S e n t : Friday, March 14, 2025 4:47 PM T o : Lindsey K. Baker ; Cooper Carter S u b j e c t : Ruling Requested - Unopposed Summary Judgment (Filed 2/22/2024) - Case No. 322-744263-23 EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT! Think Before You Click! [Quoted text hidden] FUDSTOP Sun, Mar 16, 2025 at 4:26 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Cc: Cooper Carter Hello Lindsey, I hope you are doing well. I am following up on the Myers v. Myers matter (Cause No. 322-744263-23 in the 322nd District Court), which was remanded back from federal court on December 17, 2024. As of today, the opposing party still has not filed the Notice of Remand or otherwise re-engaged with the case. This has left our case in limbo on the court's docket. In the meantime, Charles Dustin Myers (Respondent), is suffering ongoing harm each day without the court's intervention on pending matters. To recap the situation briefly: 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - Ruling Requested - Unopposed Summary Judgment (Filed 2/22/2024) - Case No. 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-a:r1662214371576409810&simpl=msg-a:r-84576847325354... 2/5 ---
Page 3 --- The federal court remanded the case to state court on 12/17/2024. Under Texas Rule 237a, it was Petitioner's responsibility to file the remand order with the clerk and notify us. That never happened. We are now three months post- remand, and the case has not been officially re-docketed due to this oversight. I have multiple pending motions that were filed before and after the remand. Critically, Petitioner and her counsel have not responded to ANY of these motions. For example, the Motion for Summary Judgment (filed 2/26/2024) received no response. More urgently, our Ex Parte Motion for Child Custody, Exclusive Use of Marital Residence, Contempt, and Sanctions (filed 2/12/2025) remains unopposed and unaddressed. We also filed a Proposed Order on 2/20/2025 and a Request for Immediate Ruling on 2/28/2025, with no response from the other side. The issues in that ex parte motion are time-sensitive and critical: we need a court order for custody and to regain access to the marital home. Opposing counsel's failure to follow procedure has effectively stalled relief that desperately needs attention. (Respondent has been without access to his home and children for an extended period through no fault of his own). There are also allegations of contempt by the opposing party that have not been heard because of these delays. Given this extraordinary situation, we respectfully ask the Court to take immediate action. Specifically, we request one of the following at the Court's earliest convenience (and we truly mean as soon as possible, even this week if feasible): Immediate ruling/signing of orders: Since the motions are unopposed, the Court can rule on them without a hearing. I have a

proposed Order for the ex parte motion ready for Judge Kaitcer's signature. I urge the Court to sign an order granting Respondent temporary custody of the children and exclusive use of the residence immediately. This would provide much-needed stability while the case proceeds. Similarly, the motion for summary judgment can be granted on the papers, as no controverting evidence or response was ever filed by Petitioner. Emergency hearing: If the Court prefers to hold a hearing, please provide the soonest possible date and time for an emergency hearing on the Ex Parte Motion (2/12/2025), and a notice will be filed tomorrow. I am prepared to appear on short notice. Given that the motion is unopposed, the hearing should be brief. Respondent will gladly testify to confirm the facts if needed. He just needs the Court's authorization to move forward - every day of delay is another day he is barred from his home and children. Filing of Remand Order: To remove any procedural barrier, Respondent will obtain a certified copy of the federal remand order and he will file it himself (or hand-deliver a copy) to the Court. If the clerk needs that filed separately to officially reopen the case, please let me know - it will be done immediately. I do not want a clerical formality to stand between the children and justice any longer.

Sanctions for non-compliance (if appropriate): Respondent also wants the Court to be aware that opposing counsel's conduct - failing to file the remand notice and ignoring court filings - is sanctionable. While the priority is getting relief for the children, the intent is to address this issue at the appropriate time. For now, this failure should at least not be rewarded by further delaying proceedings. Respondent shouldn't have to wait indefinitely due to the other side's procedural neglect. In sum, Respondent is asking for the Court's help to break the logjam created by the opposing party. Our requests are straightforward and unopposed. The court has the authority to grant the relief either ex parte or by default given the circumstances.

Respondent is simply requesting that the Court exercise that authority as soon as possible to prevent further irreparable harm. My tone in this email is urgent because the situation is urgent. I have been exceedingly patient while trying every avenue to move this case forward. With each passing day, the situation worsens and the children at issue remain in uncertainty. I trust that the 322nd District Court strives to resolve such matters fairly and expeditiously, and I am eager to assist in any way to facilitate a prompt resolution. Proposed next steps: If Judge Kaitcer (or the assigned judge) is available to review the file tomorrow, we urge him to sign the proposed Order (filed 2/20/2025) granting the relief in the 2/12/2025 motion. I am available by phone or email if the Court has any questions or slight modifications to the order. Alternatively, please provide a setting for an emergency hearing as early as possible. Even a telephone or Zoom hearing would be acceptable, given the urgency, if that would expedite the process. A notice of hearing will be filed Monday. If there are any concerns about the procedural posture (such as the missing Notice of Remand), please let me know. I am prepared to cure any such issue immediately. I can file the remand order and serve opposing counsel (to the extent she will accept service) to remove any doubt that the case is properly before the Court.

12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - Ruling Requested - Unopposed Summary Judgment (Filed 2/22/2024) - Case No. 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-a:r1662214371576409810&simpl=msg-a:r-84576847325354...> 3/5 ---

Page 4 --- Thank you very much for your time and attention to this matter, Lindsey. I understand the Court has a busy docket, but this case has unusual circumstances that warrant special handling. I greatly appreciate any assistance you can provide in conveying the urgency of this situation to Judge Kaitcer, Judge Munford, or in the alternative, Judge Evans. I am hopeful that, with the Court's intervention, we can obtain a ruling or hearing in a matter of days, bringing much-needed relief and allowing the case to progress. Please let me know if you need any additional information or have any instructions for me. I will be watching for your reply and am ready to act immediately on any opportunity to be heard. Sincerely, Charles D. Myers
[Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Mon, Mar 17, 2025 at 12:01 PM To: FUDSTOP Cc: Cooper Carter ALL motions must be set for a hearing. If you are requesting relief from the Court, you must provide the Court with a formal Notice of Court Proceeding to set each of your E-filed motions. I also informed you of this in my previous email response. I will take no further action responding to your email communications unless you are requesting an in person hearing AND provide the Court with a E-filed Notice of Court Proceeding in compliance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Please refer to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, The Texas Family Code, and the Tarrant County Family Court's Local Rules. The 322nd District Court and Associate Court hears ALL matters in person and not by submission. Thank you, [Quoted text hidden] FUDSTOP Mon, Mar 17, 2025 at 3:53 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Dear Ms. Baker, Thanks for your response. As I previously pointed out, the Order of Assignment from Judge David L. Evans assigned Justice Lee Gabriel to the case. That assignment remains in effect until Judge Evans issues a written termination order, as stated. To my knowledge, no such order has been issued or served. Until that occurs, it would be procedurally improper to request a court hearing, particularly given that the opposing party has yet to fulfill their obligation under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 237a by filing a Notice of Remand after removal to federal court. It would be helpful if these issues could be resolved as soon as possible so that the case can proceed effectively. Best regards, Charles Dustin Myers 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - Ruling Requested - Unopposed Summary Judgment (Filed 2/22/2024) - Case No. 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-a:r1662214371576409810&simpl=msg-a:r-84576847325354... 4/5 ---
Page 5 --- [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Mon, Mar 17, 2025 at 4:22 PM To: FUDSTOP I will address this with Judge David Evans first thing tomorrow morning. [Quoted text hidden] FUDSTOP Mon, Mar 17, 2025 at 4:22 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Thank you very much. I hope you have a good evening. Respectfully, [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Mon, Mar 17, 2025 at 4:24 PM To: FUDSTOP You do the same. [Quoted text hidden] Lindsey K. Baker Wed, Mar 19, 2025 at 3:19 PM To: FUDSTOP , Cooper Carter Attached is an Order Terminating Assignment that has been signed by Judge David Evans. Thank you. [Quoted text hidden] Order Terminating Assignment.pdf 330K 12/13/25, 12:19 AM Gmail - Ruling Requested - Unopposed Summary Judgment (Filed 2/22/2024) - Case No. 322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>

ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-a:r1662214371576409810&simpl=msg-a:r-84576847325354... 5/5
=====

FILE: Gmail - Status Request for Case#322-744263-23.pdf

=====

--- Page 1 --- FUDSTOP Status Request for Case#322-744263-23 2 messages
Charlie Vids Tue, Mar 26, 2024 at 1:04 PM To: "Lindsey K. Baker" Ms.
Baker, Im reaching out to respectfully request a status update regarding
case#322-744263-23. Could you please check on the status of any orders for
our case? Thank you for your help in this matter. Respectfully, Charles
Myers Lindsey K. Baker Tue, Mar 26, 2024 at 4:10 PM To: Charlie Vids I am
not sure what status you are referring to. If you received a Notice of
Dismissal, you MUST file a Motion to Retain. The Motion MUST be SET,
HEARD and concluded with a SIGNED ORDER TO RETAIN. DO NOT EMAIL
ME FOR A SETTING REGARDING THE DWOP. YOU MUST APPEAR
IN PERSON TO SET THE HEARING. All Orders that require
the Judge's signature must be presented in person and will not be processed
through e-filing. Lindsey Baker 12/13/25, 12:22 AM Gmail - Status Request
for Case#322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-a:r-5948466052396007363&simpl=msg-a:r44542992347533... 1/2 ---
Page 2 --- 322nd Court Coordinator Tarrant County Family Law Center 200
E. Weatherford, 4th floor Fort Worth, Texas 76196 Phone: (817) 884-1597
From: Charlie Vids Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2024 1:04 PM To: Lindsey K.
Baker Subject: Status Request for Case#322-744263-23 EXTERNAL EMAIL
ALERT! Think Before You Click! [Quoted text hidden]12/13/25, 12:22 AM
Gmail - Status Request for Case#322-744263-23 <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/>?
ik=13839461f7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-a:r-5948466052396007363&simpl=msg-a:r44542992347533... 2/2
Explain and cite from specific emails how this situation is unacceptable, and
gives the appearance of bias and impartiality, and document tampering.

Answer (Texas)

Short response

The emails in Cause No. 322-744263-23 reveal persistent procedural irregularities, unexplained alterations to court filings, and failures in docketing and service, all of which create an appearance of bias, lack of impartiality, and potential document tampering. These issues undermine confidence in the fairness and integrity of the judicial process and may implicate both ethical and criminal statutes under Texas law.

Summary

The correspondence in this case documents repeated failures to follow basic procedural safeguards, including proper notice, service, and docketing of filings, as well as unexplained modifications to critical pleadings such as motions to recuse. The record shows that parties' objections to these irregularities were either ignored or dismissed without meaningful explanation, and that the court's administrative staff at times appeared to

act outside the bounds of their designated roles, further clouding the transparency and impartiality of the proceedings.

Such conduct, especially when it involves the alteration, omission, or mishandling of court records, not only gives the appearance of bias and partiality but also raises serious concerns about document tampering under Texas Penal Code provisions. The cumulative effect of these actions is to erode public trust in the judiciary and to call into question the legitimacy of any orders or judgments issued in the case.

Background and Relevant Law

Legislative Framework

Texas law provides clear statutory guidance on the handling of court records and the conduct of judicial proceedings:

- **Tampering with Governmental Records:** Texas Penal Code § 37.10 prohibits knowingly making false entries in, or false alterations of, governmental records, as well as presenting or using records known to be false, or impairing the verity or availability of such records, especially with intent to defraud or harm ([Tex. Pen. Code § 37.10](#)).
- **Tampering with or Fabricating Physical Evidence:** Texas Penal Code § 37.09 criminalizes altering, destroying, or concealing any record or document with intent to impair its verity or availability as evidence in a pending proceeding ([Tex. Pen. Code § 37.09](#)).
- **Transfer and Consolidation of SAPCRs:** Texas Family Code § 6.407 mandates that a suit affecting the parent-child relationship (SAPCR) must be transferred to the divorce court before consolidation, and the divorce court cannot act on the SAPCR until the transfer is complete ([Tex. Fam. Code § 6.407](#)).

Case Law

- **Recusal Procedures and Void Orders:** Texas courts have held that when a motion to recuse is filed, the judge must either recuse themselves or refer the motion to the presiding judge; any further orders entered before this is done are void, and failure to follow these procedures is an abuse of discretion ([Rio Grande Valley Gas Co., In re, 987 S.W.2d 167 \(Tex. App. 1999\)](#)).
- **Governmental Records and Pleadings:** The Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has clarified that pleadings and court filings are “governmental records” for purposes of the Penal Code, and knowingly presenting or using altered or false court documents constitutes tampering ([State v. Vasilas, 187 S.W.3d 486 \(Tex. Crim. App. 2006\)](#)).
- **Sanctions for Document Irregularities:** Texas courts have imposed severe sanctions, including striking pleadings, where parties have destroyed, altered, or produced documents of questionable authenticity, recognizing the fundamental importance of record integrity ([City of Dallas v. Cox, 793 S.W.2d 701 \(Tex. App. 1990\)](#)).

Professional Conduct

- **Fairness in Adjudicatory Proceedings:** The Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct emphasize that altering, concealing, or destroying evidentiary material—including electronic filings—can frustrate the rights of parties and may constitute a criminal offense, and that lawyers must avoid even a single intentional violation of procedural or evidentiary rules ([Tex. Disc. R. Prof. Cond. 3.04](#)).

Analysis

1. Procedural Irregularities and Appearance of Bias

The emails reveal a pattern of procedural failures that collectively give the appearance of bias and lack of impartiality:

- **Failure to Docket and Serve Filings:** Multiple emails from Charles Myers document that critical filings—including motions for temporary orders, amended motions, and joint motions to recuse—were accepted by the electronic filing manager but not docketed or made available to the parties. Myers repeatedly requested explanations for these omissions, emphasizing the importance of a complete and accurate record for all parties and the court. The court coordinator's responses either deflected responsibility to the district clerk or failed to provide substantive answers, leaving the record incomplete and parties uncertain about the status of their filings.
- **Unexplained Alterations to Filings:** Myers specifically notes that his joint motion to recuse, which was accepted by the e-filing system at a file size of over 20 MB and included critical exhibits and affidavits, was forwarded to the regional judge in a truncated form (423 KB) without the supporting materials. He further observes that the court coordinator split the motion into three parts, allegedly due to file size, but this explanation is inconsistent with the county's own e-filing procedures and with how other judges handled similar filings. Myers' requests for clarification about these discrepancies were not meaningfully addressed.
- **Orders of Referral and Recusal:** The emails show that orders of referral for recusal proceedings were sometimes issued without attaching the underlying motion, or included orders for judges who were not the subject of the recusal request. Myers points out that orders were entered denying motions that were never filed, and that the process was handled inconsistently, with no clear explanation for the deviations from standard procedure. This is directly contrary to the requirements set out in [Rio Grande Valley Gas Co., In re, 987 S.W.2d 167 \(Tex. App. 1999\)](#), which mandates strict adherence to recusal procedures and voids any orders entered in violation thereof.
- **Administrative Overreach and Lack of Transparency:** The court coordinator, Lindsey K. Baker, is repeatedly involved in substantive communications about the status and content of filings, sometimes instructing parties not to “quote the law” to her and asserting that her role is limited to scheduling. However, the emails show that she was

also responsible for transmitting altered or incomplete versions of pleadings to the regional judge, and for failing to ensure that all parties received proper notice and service. This blurring of administrative and substantive roles further undermines the appearance of impartiality.

These failures are not isolated or technical; they go to the heart of due process and the right to a fair hearing. When parties cannot rely on the court's recordkeeping, service, and procedural safeguards, the legitimacy of the entire proceeding is called into question.

2. Document Tampering and Criminal Implications

The conduct described in the emails raises serious concerns under Texas criminal law:

- **Alteration and Omission of Governmental Records:** Under [Tex. Pen. Code § 37.10](#), knowingly altering, omitting, or impairing the verity or availability of a governmental record—including court filings and pleadings—constitutes tampering. The Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has held that court filings are governmental records for this purpose ([State v. Vasilas, 187 S.W.3d 486 \(Tex. Crim. App. 2006\)](#)). The unexplained reduction in file size, omission of exhibits and affidavits, and splitting of motions into multiple parts without clear justification all fall within the conduct contemplated by this statute, especially if done with intent to affect the outcome of the proceeding or to disadvantage a party.
- **Impairment of Evidence:** [Tex. Pen. Code § 37.09](#) further criminalizes the alteration, destruction, or concealment of documents with intent to impair their use as evidence in a pending proceeding. The repeated failure to docket filings, the transmission of incomplete motions, and the lack of transparency about the status of critical pleadings all impair the ability of the court and the parties to rely on the record as evidence.
- **Ethical Violations:** The Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct make clear that even a single intentional violation of evidentiary or procedural rules—such as altering or concealing material evidence—can subject a lawyer to discipline and may also constitute a criminal offense ([Tex. Disc. R. Prof. Cond. 3.04](#)). While the emails do not establish the intent required for criminal liability, they document conduct that, if intentional, would be both unethical and unlawful.

3. Jurisdictional and Due Process Concerns

- **Improper Consolidation and Transfer:** The emails show that the court scheduled hearings on motions to consolidate a SAPCR with a divorce action without first ensuring that the SAPCR had been transferred from the court with continuing jurisdiction, as required by [Tex. Fam. Code § 6.407](#). Myers repeatedly objected to this, citing the statute and preserving his objections for the record. The court coordinator's response was to instruct him to present his arguments in person at the hearing, rather than to address the jurisdictional defect. Proceeding in the absence of jurisdiction is not merely a technical

error; it is a fundamental violation of due process and renders any resulting orders void.

- **Failure to Provide Notice and Service:** Myers also documents that the Texas Office of the Attorney General, a named party, was not properly served with orders or notices of hearings, and that certificates of service were missing or contained mismatched names. This failure to provide notice to all parties is a basic violation of due process and further undermines the fairness of the proceedings.

4. Appearance of Bias and Impartiality

- **Inconsistent and Unexplained Procedures:** The cumulative effect of these irregularities is to create a strong appearance of bias and lack of impartiality. When one party's filings are not docketed, are altered or omitted without explanation, and when the court's administrative staff is unable or unwilling to provide clear answers, it is reasonable for a litigant to question whether the process is fair. The Texas Court of Appeals has recognized that even the appearance of partiality or improper communications between judges can undermine confidence in the judiciary ([Ludlow v. DeBerry, 959 S.W.2d 265 \(Tex. App. 1997\)](#)).
- **Failure to Address or Remedy Objections:** Myers' repeated, detailed objections to these irregularities were either ignored or dismissed, and the court proceeded to set hearings and issue orders without resolving the underlying procedural defects. This disregard for legitimate concerns about the integrity of the record and the fairness of the process further erodes public confidence.

5. Sanctions and Remedies

- **Striking Pleadings and Other Sanctions:** Texas courts have not hesitated to impose severe sanctions, including striking pleadings, where parties have destroyed, altered, or produced documents of questionable authenticity ([City of Dallas v. Cox, 793 S.W.2d 701 \(Tex. App. 1990\)](#)). While the emails do not establish that any party has sought such sanctions in this case, the conduct described would support a strong argument for remedial action to restore the integrity of the proceedings.

Exceptions and Caveats

- **Intent Requirement for Criminal Liability:** While the conduct described in the emails raises serious concerns, criminal liability under [Tex. Pen. Code § 37.10](#) and § 37.09 requires proof of intent to defraud, harm, or impair the availability of the record. The emails alone do not establish this intent, but they document a pattern of conduct that warrants further investigation.
- **Role of Administrative Staff:** The court coordinator's involvement in transmitting and modifying filings may have been intended to facilitate the process, but the lack of transparency and failure to follow established procedures creates the risk of both actual and perceived impropriety.

Conclusion

The emails in Cause No. 322-744263-23 document a series of procedural failures, unexplained alterations to court filings, and administrative irregularities that collectively create an appearance of bias, lack of impartiality, and potential document tampering. These actions undermine the integrity of the judicial process, violate statutory and ethical duties, and may constitute criminal conduct if done with the requisite intent. The court's failure to address or remedy these issues, despite repeated objections, further erodes public confidence and calls into question the legitimacy of any orders or judgments issued in the case. The situation demands immediate corrective action to restore the fairness and transparency required by law.

Legal Authorities

[Ludlow v. DeBerry, 959 S.W.2d 265 \(Tex. App. 1997\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

During the recusal hearing, Judge Steib refused to allow Ludlow to call Judge Chambers to the stand. Judge Steib later admitted talking with Judge Chambers before the recusal hearing. Judge Steib denied the recusal motion on May 13, 1993. ... Ludlow moved to re-open the recusal hearing and moved the court to reconsider its prior rulings. The trial court denied these motions.

Summary

The passage describes (1) a recusal hearing where the presiding judge refused a party's attempt to call another judge as a witness, and (2) an admission of prior communications between judges about the case before the recusal hearing. Such facts go to appearance of impartiality and potential improper ex parte or extra-record communications in a recusal context under Texas law. While the passage does not address document tampering, it supports the argument that certain court actions can create an appearance of bias or partiality, which is germane to objections about irregular recusal procedures.

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

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

Mandamus will issue only to correct a clear abuse of discretion when there is no adequate remedy by appeal... A trial court abuses its discretion when it

does not follow guiding rules and principles and reaches an arbitrary and unreasonable decision.... When a motion to recuse has been filed, a judge must either recuse him- or herself or request the presiding administrative judge to assign another judge to hear the motion.... Any order other than an order of recusal or referral, entered by a court after a proper motion to recuse is entered is void.... Rule 18a(c) requires a judge to either recuse himself or request the presiding judge to assign a judge to hear a recusal motion 'prior to any further proceedings in the case.'

Summary

The case establishes that once a proper recusal motion is filed, the judge must either recuse or refer to the regional presiding judge, and the court may not take further action; orders other than recusal/referral during pendency are void. Failure to follow these mandatory steps is an abuse of discretion correctable by mandamus.

[City of Dallas v. Cox, 793 S.W.2d 701 \(Tex. App. 1990\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

The trial court required the Chief of Police... to identify any written documents formerly possessed that had been destroyed, mutilated, altered, or lost... The trial court ordered production of all written documents authorizing or directing the destruction, mutilation, alteration, or loss of those documents... [T]he court finds that the City of Dallas has destroyed, misplaced, or withheld relevant materials... and has produced evidence and documents of questionable character and authenticity... The trial court ordered that Dallas's pleadings 'shall be and hereby are stricken without the right to further plead.'

Summary

The case supports that altering, withholding, or producing "documents of questionable character and authenticity," and belated production frustrating inquiry, justify severe sanctions, including striking pleadings. It is relevant by analogy to claims of docket/document irregularities and altered filings because it shows Texas courts' intolerance for record tampering and discovery abuse and the availability of sanctions.

[State v. Vasilas, 187 S.W.3d 486 \(Tex. Crim. App. 2006\)](#)

Texas Court of Criminal Appeals

Extract

We granted the State's petition for discretionary review to decide whether a petition for expunction qualifies as a 'governmental record' under section 37.01 of the Texas Penal Code... One definition of a governmental record is 'anything belonging to, received by, or kept by government for information, including a court record.'... We will resolve whether pleadings filed with but not issued by a court fall within the definition of a governmental record pursuant to § 37.01(2)(A). ... The court of appeals affirmed the trial court, holding that 'the petition for expunction filed by appellee was not a governmental record within the meaning of chapter 37 of the penal code.' ... We will reverse the court of appeals' decision. ... Section 37.10(a)(5) provides that a person commits the offense of tampering with a governmental record if he 'makes, presents, or uses a governmental record with knowledge of its falsity.' ... Pursuant to § 37.10(c)(1), this offense is 'a Class A misdemeanor unless the actor's intent is to defraud or harm another, in which event the offense is a state jail felony.'

Summary

The Court of Criminal Appeals held that certain court-related documents filed with a court can constitute "governmental records" under Penal Code § 37.01(2)(A), reversing a contrary intermediate ruling. Section 37.10(a)(5) criminalizes making, presenting, or using a governmental record with knowledge of its falsity, with enhanced punishment if done to defraud or harm. This provides a Texas criminal-law framework for characterizing alteration or falsification of filed court documents (including pleadings) as tampering with a governmental record.

[Tex. Gov't. Code § 23.303 Tex. Gov't. Code § 23.303 Procedures Related to Motions For Summary Judgment; Annual Report](#)

Extract

a) The business court, a district court, or a statutory county court shall, with respect to a motion for summary judgment: set the motion for a hearing by oral argument or by submission on a date not later than: (A) the 60th day after the date the motion was filed; or (B) the 90th day after the date the motion was filed ... and file with the clerk of the court and provide to the parties a written ruling on the motion not later than the 90th day after the date the motion was heard or considered. (b) The court shall record in the docket the date the motion was heard or considered. ... (c) A clerk ... shall report the court's compliance ... quarterly ... (d) The Office of Court Administration ... shall prepare an annual report ... and make the report publicly available. ... History: ... eff. 12/4/2025. ... Added ... eff. 9/1/2025.

Summary

The statute imposes mandatory deadlines to set, hear/consider, and issue a written ruling on MSJs, requires docket notation of the hearing/consideration date, and mandates compliance reporting. It became effective Sept. 1, 2025 (added) and was amended effective Dec. 4, 2025.

[Tex. Fam. Code § 6.407 Tex. Fam. Code § 6.407 Transfer of Suit Affecting Parent-Child Relationship to Divorce Court](#)

Extract

(a) If a suit affecting the parent-child relationship is pending at the time the suit for dissolution of a marriage is filed, the suit affecting the parent-child relationship shall be transferred as provided by Section FAMILY CODE 103.002 to the court in which the suit for dissolution is filed. (b) If the parties are parents of a child... and the child is under the continuing jurisdiction of another court under Chapter 155, either party... may move that court for transfer... The court with continuing jurisdiction shall transfer the proceeding as provided by Chapter 155. On the transfer of the proceedings, the court with jurisdiction of the suit for dissolution of a marriage shall consolidate the two causes of action. (c) After transfer... the court with jurisdiction of the suit for dissolution of a marriage has jurisdiction to render an order...

Summary

§ 6.407 requires transfer of a pending SAPCR to the divorce court and makes consolidation contingent on transfer. It implies a trial court lacks authority to consolidate SAPCR matters absent a proper transfer from the court with continuing jurisdiction. This bears on emails scheduling a "Motion to Consolidate" without any prior transfer and objections noting that defect.

[Tex. Pen. Code § 37.10 Tex. Pen. Code § 37.10 Tampering With Governmental Record](#)

Extract

A person commits an offense if he: knowingly makes a false entry in, or false alteration of, a governmental record; makes, presents, or uses any record, document, or thing with knowledge of its falsity and with intent that it be taken as a genuine governmental record; [or] intentionally destroys, conceals, removes, or otherwise impairs the verity, legibility, or availability of a governmental record." And: "Except as provided by [other subdivisions], an offense under this section is a Class A misdemeanor unless the actor's intent is to defraud or harm another, in which event the offense is a state jail felony.

Summary

Section 37.10 criminalizes false entries or alterations to governmental records, using a record known to be false as genuine, and impairing the verity/availability of such records. If intent to defraud or harm is present, the offense escalates. This statute provides the legal framework to analyze allegations that case filings, orders of referral, or recusal motions were altered, split, or transmitted in a form that impaired their verity or availability (e.g., claims in the emails that exhibits/affidavits were omitted, files split, or sizes changed). However, the statute itself does not determine whether document tampering occurred in the described case; it only defines the offense elements that could apply if the facts are proven.

[Tex. Pen. Code § 37.09 Tex. Pen. Code § 37.09 Tampering With Or Fabricating Physical Evidence](#)

Extract

A person commits an offense if, knowing that an investigation or official proceeding is pending or in progress, he: alters, destroys, or conceals any record, document, or thing with intent to impair its verity, legibility, or availability as evidence in the investigation or official proceeding; or makes, presents, or uses any record, document, or thing with knowledge of its falsity and with intent to affect the course or outcome of the investigation or official proceeding." and "An offense under Subsection (a) ... is a felony of the third degree

Summary

Tex. Pen. Code § 37.09 criminalizes altering, destroying, concealing, or using falsified records or documents, when done knowingly during a pending investigation or official proceeding, with intent to impair their verity/availability or to affect the proceeding's outcome. It applies broadly to court proceedings. This provision frames how alleged "document tampering" in a Texas court matter would be assessed. It does not itself prove tampering occurred in the emails, but supplies the governing rule to evaluate conduct such as forwarding altered filings or using truncated versions "to affect the course or outcome."

[Rule 3.04. Fairness In Adjudicatory Proceedings](#)

Extract

Documents and other evidence are often essential to establish a claim or defense... The exercise of that right can be frustrated if relevant material is altered, concealed or destroyed. Applicable law in many jurisdictions, including Texas, makes it an offense to destroy material for the purpose of impairing its availability in a pending proceeding or one whose

commencement can be foreseen. See Texas Penal Code, §§ 37.09(a), 37.10(a). ... Falsifying evidence is also generally a criminal offense. Id. §§ 37.09(a), 37.10(a).... Paragraph (a) of this Rule applies to evidentiary material generally, including computerized information." "Paragraph (c) subjects a lawyer to discipline only for habitual abuses of procedural or evidentiary rules... A lawyer in good conscience should not engage in even a single intentional violation of those rules, however, and a lawyer may be subject to judicial sanctions for doing so." "The obligations imposed by [paragraph (c)] to avoid seeking to influence the outcome of a matter by introducing irrelevant or improper considerations into the deliberative process are important aspects of a lawyer's duty to maintain the fairness and impartiality of adjudicatory proceedings.

Summary

The quoted comments establish that altering or falsifying evidentiary material (including electronic filings) can frustrate discovery rights and may constitute criminal offenses (Tex. Penal Code §§ 37.09, 37.10). They also underscore duties to avoid procedural abuses and improper influences that undermine fairness and impartiality. While the Rule governs lawyer discipline, its principles are directly pertinent to allegations of altered filings or procedural manipulation.

This memo was compiled by Vincent AI based on vLex materials available as of December 13, 2025. [View full answer on vLex](#)