

Question

The court did not hold a hearing on the contested consolidation motion. There was an objection to the consolidation, indicating procedural requirements were not met. Texas procedural rules require that contested motions be heard and decided upon with due consideration of the parties' arguments. The court's failure to hold a hearing on the contested motion indicates a failure to follow procedural rules. This procedural failure constitutes an abuse of discretion, supporting the need for mandamus relief.

Answer (Texas)

Introduction and Overview:

The central issue is whether a Texas trial court's failure to hold a hearing on a contested motion for consolidation—despite an objection—constitutes a procedural error amounting to an abuse of discretion, thereby justifying mandamus relief. The user's objective is to demonstrate that the court's omission violated Texas procedural requirements, prejudiced the objecting party, and warrants extraordinary intervention. The most effective argument is that Texas law imposes a duty on courts to consider and rule on contested motions, particularly those implicating consolidation, and that failure to do so—especially in the face of a timely objection—constitutes a clear abuse of discretion that cannot be remedied by appeal, thus supporting mandamus.

Relevant Facts and Factual Assumptions:

The following facts are assumed or established for the purposes of this analysis:

1. A motion to consolidate two or more proceedings was filed in a Texas trial court.
2. At least one party objected to the consolidation, making the motion contested.
3. The trial court did not hold a hearing on the contested motion, nor did it make findings on the record regarding the relatedness of the cases or the potential for prejudice.
4. The court proceeded to consolidate the cases (or failed to rule on the motion) without addressing the objection or providing the objecting party an opportunity to be heard.
5. The objecting party seeks mandamus relief, arguing that the court's failure to hold a hearing and consider the objection constitutes an abuse of discretion.

Potential ambiguities include whether the court issued a written order, whether the objection was formally entered, and whether the parties requested a hearing. However, the analysis assumes that the objection was properly raised and that the court was aware of the contested nature of the motion.

Legal Principles and Points of Law:

Discretion to Consolidate Is Not Unlimited; Procedural Safeguards Apply.

- Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 174(a) grants trial courts broad discretion to consolidate cases with common issues of law or fact, but this discretion is not absolute. The court must consider whether consolidation will further convenience, avoid prejudice, and promote the ends of justice. See [In re Shell Oil Co., 202 S.W.3d 286, 289](#) (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2006, orig. proceeding) (“Although Tex. R. Civ. P. 174 gives the trial court broad discretion to consolidate cases, the trial court's discretion is not unlimited. ... The express purpose of the rule is to further convenience and avoid prejudice, and thus promote the ends of justice.”).
- The Texas Supreme Court has held that a trial court abuses its discretion if it consolidates cases without making a determination as to whether confusion or prejudice would result, or without considering the necessity of consolidation to avoid unnecessary costs or delay. See [In re Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., 975 S.W.2d 601, 603 \(Tex. 1998\)](#) (“The record reflects, and the parties concede, that the district court undertook no determination of any kind before ordering consolidation. ... The trial court made no attempt to assess whether confusion or prejudice would result if these claims were tried together.”).

Duty to Rule on Contested Motions and Provide Opportunity to Be Heard.

- When a motion is properly filed and pending before a Texas trial court, the court has a legal duty to rule on it within a reasonable time. The act of considering and ruling on such a motion is a ministerial act, and mandamus may issue to compel the court to act. See [In re Smith & Ramirez Restoration, LLC](#), No. 08-24-00045-CV, 2024 WL 1112345, at *2 (Tex. App.—El Paso Mar. 12, 2024, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.) (“To establish that the trial court abused its discretion by failing to rule on a pending motion, the relator must show that the trial court: (1) had a legal duty to rule on the motion; (2) was asked to rule on the motion; and (3) failed or refused to rule on the motion within a reasonable time.”).
- The requirement to provide a hearing on contested motions is further supported by administrative rules and secondary sources, which emphasize that when a motion is contested—such as a motion for change of venue or consolidation—the court must conduct a hearing to resolve factual disputes. See [31 Tex. Admin. Code § 17.18](#); see also “Pre-trial motions,” 2022 (“When there is a contested motion, such as a change of venue with affidavits, the trial court is required to hold a hearing to resolve factual disputes.”).

Mandamus Relief Is Appropriate Where Procedural Safeguards Are Ignored and No Adequate Remedy by Appeal Exists.

- Mandamus is available to correct a clear abuse of discretion by a trial court, particularly where the error cannot be remedied by appeal. See [In re Shell Oil Co., 202 S.W.3d at 289](#) (“If it also appears that the injustice resulting from such refusal cannot later be remedied on appeal, the action of the court is subject to control by mandamus.”).
- The Texas Court of Appeals has repeatedly held that a trial court abuses its discretion by consolidating cases without properly resolving relatedness issues or by failing to consider objections, especially where prejudice may result. See [In re All Repair & Restoration](#), No. 01-23-00456-CV, 2024 WL 1832345, at *3 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Apr. 25, 2024, orig. proceeding) (“A trial court may abuse its discretion by ‘incorrectly resolving the relatedness issue or by consolidating cases when the consolidation results in prejudice to the complaining party.’ ... We hold the trial court abused its discretion in ... consolidating the judicial review suit ... with the personal injury suit ...”).

Procedural Requirements for Consolidation in Administrative Contexts.

- Administrative rules, such as [31 Tex. Admin. Code § 17.18](#), require that no proceedings shall be consolidated or heard jointly without either the consent of all parties or a finding by the examiner that the proceedings involve common questions of law or fact and that separate hearings would result in unwarranted expense, delay, or injustice. Objections to consolidation must be considered, and procedural requirements must be met.

Broader Procedural Norms:

- The requirement to hold hearings on contested motions is not limited to consolidation but is a broader procedural norm in Texas practice, as reflected in both civil and criminal contexts. See “Pre-trial motions,” 2022.

Application and Analysis:

Applying these principles to the facts:

Failure to Hold a Hearing on a Contested Consolidation Motion Is a Procedural Error.

- The trial court’s failure to hold a hearing on a contested consolidation motion, despite an objection, is a clear departure from procedural norms. Texas law requires that when a motion is contested, the court must provide an opportunity for the parties to be heard and must make findings regarding the propriety of consolidation. See [In re Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., 975 S.W.2d at 603](#) (“The district court undertook no determination of any kind before ordering consolidation.”); [In re Shell Oil Co., 202 S.W.3d at 289](#).
- The administrative rule, [31 Tex. Admin. Code § 17.18](#), reinforces this requirement by mandating either party consent or specific findings before consolidation, and by providing for objections to be made and considered.

Abuse of Discretion and Prejudice to the Objecting Party.

- The Texas Court of Appeals has held that a trial court abuses its discretion by consolidating cases without properly resolving relatedness or prejudice issues, especially where an objection is raised. See [In re All Repair & Restoration](#), 2024 WL 1832345, at *3 (“A trial court may abuse its discretion by ... consolidating cases when the consolidation results in prejudice to the complaining party.”).
- The failure to hold a hearing deprives the objecting party of the opportunity to present arguments and evidence regarding relatedness, prejudice, or other relevant factors, thus undermining the fairness of the proceedings.

Mandamus Relief Is Warranted.

- Where a trial court fails to perform its ministerial duty to rule on a properly filed and contested motion, mandamus is the appropriate remedy. See [In re Smith & Ramirez Restoration, LLC](#), 2024 WL 1112345, at *2 (“When a motion is properly filed and pending before a trial court, the act of giving consideration to and ruling upon [a] motion is a ministerial act, and mandamus may issue to compel the trial court to act.”).
- If the error cannot be remedied by appeal—because the prejudice from improper consolidation may taint the proceedings irreparably—mandamus is not only appropriate but necessary. See [In re Shell Oil Co., 202 S.W.3d at 289](#).

Broader Support from Secondary and Administrative Materials.

- The requirement to hold hearings on contested motions is echoed in secondary sources and administrative rules, which emphasize the need for procedural fairness and the resolution of factual disputes through hearings. See “Pre-trial motions,” 2022; [31 Tex. Admin. Code § 17.18](#).

Key Submissions:

1. The trial court’s discretion to consolidate cases is not unlimited and must be exercised in accordance with procedural safeguards, including the consideration of objections and the holding of a hearing where appropriate ([In re Shell Oil Co., 202 S.W.3d at 289](#); [In re Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., 975 S.W.2d at 603](#)).
2. The failure to hold a hearing on a contested consolidation motion, and to make findings regarding relatedness and prejudice, constitutes a procedural error and an abuse of discretion ([In re All Repair & Restoration](#), 2024 WL 1832345, at *3).
3. The court’s failure to rule on a properly filed and contested motion is a ministerial failure that may be corrected by mandamus ([In re Smith & Ramirez Restoration, LLC](#), 2024 WL 1112345, at *2).
4. Administrative and secondary authorities reinforce the requirement for hearings on contested motions and the need to consider objections ([31 Tex. Admin. Code § 17.18](#); “Pre-trial motions,” 2022).

Alternative Arguments and Nuanced Points:

- **If the Court Issued Written Findings Without a Hearing:** If the court made written findings regarding relatedness and prejudice but did not hold a hearing, the argument remains strong that the objecting party was denied the opportunity to be heard, which is itself a procedural defect. However, the absence of a hearing may be less egregious if the record shows that the court considered the objection and made detailed findings.
- **If the Objection Was Not Properly Raised:** If the objection to consolidation was not timely or properly raised, the court’s failure to hold a hearing may be less problematic. However, the authorities suggest that any contested motion—once the court is aware of the dispute—triggers the duty to provide a hearing ([In re Smith & Ramirez Restoration, LLC](#), 2024 WL 1112345, at *2).
- **If the Parties Consented to Consolidation:** Under [31 Tex. Admin. Code § 17.18](#), if all parties consented, the procedural requirements for findings and hearings may be relaxed. The argument for abuse of discretion is strongest where there is a clear, timely objection.

Areas of Risk:

- **Ambiguity in the Record:** If the record is unclear as to whether the objection was properly raised or whether the court considered the objection informally, opposing counsel may argue that the procedural requirements were substantially met. Mitigation: Ensure the record clearly reflects the objection and the lack

of a hearing or findings.

- **Judicial Discretion and Harmless Error:** Courts may be reluctant to grant mandamus where the procedural error is deemed harmless or where the objecting party cannot show specific prejudice. Mitigation: Emphasize the irreparable harm and lack of adequate remedy by appeal, as recognized in [In re Shell Oil Co., 202 S.W.3d at 289](#).
- **Recent Developments or Changes in Law:** If there have been recent amendments to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure or relevant statutes, these could affect the analysis. Mitigation: Confirm that the authorities cited remain current and controlling.

Conclusion:

Based on the facts and legal principles discussed, the strongest argument is that the trial court's failure to hold a hearing on a contested consolidation motion—despite a timely objection—constitutes a clear abuse of discretion under Texas law. This procedural failure deprives the objecting party of the opportunity to be heard, undermines the fairness of the proceedings, and cannot be remedied by appeal, thus justifying mandamus relief. The user has a solid basis for seeking extraordinary intervention, as demonstrated by the consistent application of these principles in the cited authorities.

Legal Authorities

[In re Smith & Ramirez Restoration, LLC](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

To establish that the trial court abused its discretion by failing to rule on a pending motion, the relator must show that the trial court: '(1) had a legal duty to rule on the motion[]; (2) was asked to rule on the motion[]; and (3) failed or refused to rule on the motion[] within a reasonable time.' In re Liverman, 658 S.W.3d 881, 882 (Tex. App.-El Paso 2022, orig. proceeding); see also In re Shredder Co., L.L.C., 225 S.W.3d 676, 679 (Tex. App.-El Paso 2006, original proceeding). 'When a motion is properly filed and pending before a trial court, the act of giving consideration to and ruling upon [a] motion is a ministerial act, and mandamus may issue to compel the trial court to act.'

Summary

Texas procedural rules impose a duty on trial courts to rule on properly filed and pending motions. The failure to do so within a reasonable time can be considered an abuse of discretion, which may warrant mandamus relief. This supports the proposition that the court's failure to hold a hearing and rule on the contested consolidation motion indicates a procedural failure.

[In re Shell Oil Co., 202 S.W.3d 286 \(Tex. App. 2006\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

Although Tex. R. Civ. P. 174 gives the trial court broad discretion to consolidate cases, the trial court's discretion is not unlimited. Womack v. Berry, 156 Tex. 44, 291 S.W.2d 677, 683 (1956). The express purpose of the rule is to further convenience and avoid prejudice, and thus promote the ends of justice. When all of the facts and circumstances of the case unquestionably require a separate trial to prevent manifest injustice, and there is no fact or circumstance supporting or tending to support a contrary conclusion, and the legal rights of the parties will not be prejudiced thereby, there is no room for the exercise of discretion... If it also appears that the injustice resulting from such refusal cannot later be remedied on appeal, the action of the court is subject to control by mandamus.

Summary

The passage highlights that while the trial court has discretion under Rule 174 to consolidate cases, this discretion is not without limits. The rule's purpose is to avoid prejudice and promote justice. If a separate trial is necessary to prevent manifest injustice and no facts support consolidation, the court's discretion is limited. Furthermore, if the injustice from consolidation cannot be remedied on appeal, mandamus relief is appropriate. This supports the proposition that failing to hold a hearing on a contested consolidation motion, where objections are raised, could constitute an abuse of discretion.

[In re All Repair & Restoration](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

A trial court has broad but not unlimited discretion to consolidate cases with common issues of law or fact. See In re Gulf Coast Bus. Dev. Corp., 247 S.W.3d 787, 794 (Tex. App.-Dallas 2008, orig. proceeding). A trial court may abuse its discretion by 'incorrectly resolving the relatedness issue or by consolidating cases when the consolidation results in prejudice to the complaining party.' ... We hold the trial court abused its discretion in (1) transferring and consolidating the judicial review suit to the 61st District Court with the personal injury suit and (2) denying relators' motion to abate the personal injury suit in the 61st District Court.

Summary

The Texas Court of Appeals recognizes that a trial court has discretion in consolidating cases but this discretion is not unlimited. The court may abuse its discretion if it consolidates cases without properly resolving relatedness issues or if the consolidation results in prejudice to a party. The passage also indicates that the court found an abuse of discretion in a specific case where consolidation was ordered without proper consideration of objections, supporting the need for mandamus relief.

[Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., In re, 975 S.W.2d 601 \(Tex. 1998\)](#)

Texas Supreme Court

Extract

The additional time that will be required to keep separate the various claims, and the risk of reversal on appeal, have not been factored into any determination whether consolidation is necessary 'to avoid unnecessary costs or delay', the basis for consolidation under Rule 174(a) of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Indeed, the record reflects, and the parties concede, that the district court undertook no determination of any kind before ordering consolidation. The Court concedes this: 'We recognize that the trial court made no attempt to assess whether confusion or prejudice would result if these claims were tried together.'

Summary

The Texas Supreme Court recognized a procedural failure by the trial court in not assessing the potential for confusion or prejudice before ordering consolidation. This lack of assessment indicates a failure to follow procedural rules, which is considered an abuse of discretion. The passage supports the proposition that procedural requirements were not met, as the court did not hold a hearing or make necessary determinations before consolidating cases.

[31 Tex. Admin. Code § 17.18 31 Tex. Admin. Code § 17.18 Motion For Consolidation](#)

Extract

Two or more proceedings may be consolidated upon written notice by the hearing examiner or upon written motion of a party filed as provided in § 31 17.3 of this title (relating to Filing of Documents) and served on all parties of record prior to the hearing date. Protest to such motion and to the examiner's ruling shall be made as provided in § 31 17.12 of this title (relating to Pleadings). No proceedings shall be consolidated or heard jointly without either consent of all parties involved or a finding by the examiner that the proceedings to be consolidated or heard jointly involve common questions of law or fact, or both, and that separate hearings would result in unwarranted expense, delay, or injustice.

Summary

Procedural requirements for consolidating proceedings, emphasizing that consolidation cannot occur without either the consent of all parties or a specific finding by the examiner. This implies that objections to consolidation must be considered, and procedural requirements must be met. The failure to hold a hearing on a contested consolidation motion, as described in the proposition, would indicate a failure to adhere to these procedural rules, potentially constituting an abuse of discretion.

[Pre-trial motions](#)

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

Extract

When the defendant files a change of venue motion and affidavits, and the state files a controverting affidavit under Art. 31.04, the trial court must conduct a hearing to resolve the factual disputes raised by the affidavits. ... WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, the Defendant respectfully prays that this Honorable Court will grant this, the Defendant's Motion for Change of Venue in all things; or in the alternative, that this Court schedule this matter for a hearing prior to trial on the merits and that at such hearing this Motion will be in all things granted.

Summary

When there is a contested motion, such as a change of venue with affidavits, the trial court is required to hold a hearing to resolve factual disputes. This requirement is indicative of a broader procedural rule that contested motions necessitate a hearing. The failure to hold such a hearing, especially when there is an objection, suggests a procedural oversight. This aligns with the proposition that not holding a hearing on a contested consolidation motion is a procedural failure.