

Question

1. The Respondent (Charles Dustin Myers) filed a motion to recuse the Regional Presiding Judge, David L. Evans, in the 322nd District Court of Tarrant County, Texas. 2. The recusal motion and supporting materials were not properly delivered by the clerk as required by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(e)(2); instead, a court coordinator handled the delivery and altered the materials. 3. The Regional Presiding Judge was notified of these procedural irregularities and failed to take corrective action. 4. The recusal motion has been pending for a substantial period without referral to the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court. 5. The Respondent has exhausted all other appellate and administrative remedies, including multiple mandamus petitions, all of which were denied without substantive review. 6. The continued inaction and procedural irregularities have resulted in harm to the Respondent, including denial of emergency relief and continued deprivation of property and parental rights.

1. Under Texas Government Code § 25.00255 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1), when a recusal motion is filed against a regional presiding judge, that judge has a mandatory, ministerial duty to refer the motion to the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court for assignment of another judge. 2. The law does not specify a fixed deadline for this referral, but Texas courts require that the duty be performed within a "reasonable time" as determined by the circumstances (In re Walters, 2022; In re Alpert, 276 S.W.3d 592 (Tex. App. 2008)). 3. Mandamus is the appropriate remedy to compel performance of a ministerial duty when there is no other adequate remedy at law (McLeod v. Harris, 582 S.W.2d 772 (Tex. 1979); In re Norman, 191 S.W.3d 858 (Tex. App. 2006)). 4. Any orders or actions taken by a judge after failing to comply with mandatory recusal procedures are void (In re Gold, 04-25-00085-CV (Tex. App. May 7, 2025)). 5. The Texas Supreme Court has held that strict adherence to recusal procedures is essential to maintain public confidence in the judiciary (In re Inquiry Concerning Honorable Bonnie Rangel, 677 S.W.3d 918 (Tex. 2023)).

1. The Regional Presiding Judge's failure to refer the recusal motion to the Chief Justice within a reasonable time, despite notice and opportunity to correct procedural irregularities, constitutes a violation of a clear ministerial duty. 2. The Respondent has no adequate remedy by appeal, as the harm from the judge's inaction and procedural irregularities is ongoing and not correctable on final appeal. 3. The pattern of procedural violations and the judge's refusal to act create both actual and apparent partiality, undermining the integrity of the judicial process and justifying extraordinary relief. 4. Mandamus is therefore warranted to compel the Regional Presiding Judge to immediately refer the recusal motion to the Chief Justice, as required by law.

1 322-744263-23 IN THE
322ND DISTRICT COURT OF TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS Morgan Michelle
Myers, Petitioner, v. Charles Dustin Myers, Respondent. And In the interest
of M.E.M. and C.R.M., two children. § § § § MOTION TO RECUSE § THE
REGIONAL PRESIDING § JUDGE §§§ TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS: COMES NOW, Respondent,
CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS, who respectfully submits this First Amended
Motion to Recuse the Regional Presiding Judge, David L. Evans, and in
support thereof, shows the Court the following: Since December of 2023,

Respondent has pled time and time again regarding a fraudulent scheme to divest him of his business and property that began with Morgan Michelle Myers and Daniel Kenneth Branthroover, involving interstate travel and communications. Each time the Respondent has utilized a legal pathway, he has been met with unjustifiable conduct that has, by its' very nature, willfully expanded the scope of the initial Myers- Branthroover enterprise into what it is today - a collection of officials, attorneys, and court staff members that who - when presented with unrefuted facts, and were made aware of the fraudulent scheme - chose to become entangled with the enterprise's affairs. It is of upmost importance to our judicial system that the following issues be adjudicated, and a fair and impartial judge preside over this matter who will not tolerate such behavior.

FIRST AMENDED
322-744263-23 FILED TARRANT COUNTY 9/11/2025 3:04 PM THOMAS A. WILDER DISTRICT CLERK 2 I. SCOPE The factual allegations raised herein are not conclusory and are supported by the record directly. Furthermore, given that Respondent has filed six mandamus petitions naming Honorables James Munford, Jeffrey Kaitcer, Kenneth Newell, Kate Stone, David Evans, and John Cayce as respondents, the record exists within the public domain and can be found here: <https://search.txcourts.gov/SearchMedia.aspx?MediaVersionID=8e2d45b4-fb4f-40a0-93bc9ed5f3cebd&coa=coissup&DT=RECORD&MediaID=804ac8d3-9b5f-40b0-bc41-bbc08c814365>

Those who have been made aware of the fraudulent scheme but have inadvertently furthered its' affairs amount to two district judges, two associate judges, two visiting retired judges, the regional presiding judge, two court coordinators, one deputy clerk, and a licensed attorney, forming an associate-in-fact enterprise for purposes of RICO, as explained below. II. GROUNDS FOR RECUSAL The Regional Presiding Judge has permitted and recklessly tolerated an ongoing RICO Enterprise that continues to expand within the Texas Judiciary due to the collective and willful neglect by the enjoined individuals to uphold their mandatory duties. By neglecting the responsibilities of his position of power, David L. Evans has inadvertently aided in the furtherance of the RICO enterprise's primary objective: to secure a fraudulent final decree of divorce and escape accountability. As the record establishes, the Respondent has exhausted every appellate and administrative remedy in an attempt to seek redress. Unopposed relief continues to be denied, and more predicate acts in furtherance of the enterprise's affairs continue to occur. For the forthcoming reasons, David L. Evans must recuse from this matter:

3 II. GROUNDS FOR RECUSAL

A. Disregard for Recusal Procedure

1. Texas law mandates strict adherence to procedural safeguards in the recusal process to ensure both actual and apparent judicial impartiality. When a court coordinator—who is not a neutral party and serves at the pleasure of the judge subject to recusal—handles the administrative delivery of a recusal motion, this contravenes the explicit requirements of Rule 18a(e) and creates an appearance of impropriety.
2. David L. Evans has allowed the coordinator Lindsey Baker—not the clerk—to handle the duties the legislature explicitly designates to court clerks. Rule 18a(e)(2) plainly states that "...when a respondent judge signs and files an order of recusal or referral, the clerk of the court must immediately deliver a copy to the regional presiding judge."
3. Furthermore, as Rule 18(a)(f)(3) also plainly states, "...if the respondent judge fails to comply with a duty imposed by this rule, the movant may notify the regional presiding judge."
4. Here, the Regional Presiding Judge was notified of and

provided with a modified version of the recusal motion rather than the original, and was notified of these discrepancies, but chose to ignore them. B. Recusal Tampering 5. The record facially establishes that on October 7, 2024, the Respondent filed a Joint Motion to Recuse Honorable Judges James Munford and Jeffrey Kaitcer from the matter and provided supporting evidence which is self-authenticating under the Texas Rules of Evidence. 6. The following day, on October 8 at 4:42 P.M., correspondence was received from court coordinator Lindsey Baker regarding the order of referral. REC. 1277 4 7. Upon inspection, it was discovered that the affidavit and exhibits were both missing from the motion which was sent to the Regional Judge, and this was quickly pointed out to the coordinator. 8. She confirms that the exhibits were indeed filed electronically but as the clerk's office prefers - they were filed as one document, just as the Tarrant County District Clerk's Filing FAQ states: Q: "What process should be used for eFiling exhibits?" A: "Same process for exhibit as initial filings- Exhibits should be merged into one document with the lead document." REC. 1262. C. Repeated Tampering 9. The record facially shows that on October 10, 2024, Judge James Munford filed an "Amended Order of Referral" and once again the correspondence to David L Evans was handled by the coordinator. 10. This time, the coordinator claimed that due to the "size of the motion" that it could be justified to split the motion into three separate files, this time with the exhibits and affidavit included, defeating the entire purpose of removing the exhibits and affidavit two days earlier. REC. 1282 D. Objecting 11. All of these issues were raised in both notice and an objection filed timely after these issues were discovered. REC. 1245-1252 It included all email exchanges with the coordinator, the modifications of the original motion, with the objection specifically stating that "the explanation changed to the document being too large. This inconsistency raises concerns about transparency and procedural fairness." No action was taken by David Evans. 5 E. Subsequent Recusals 12. After waiting four months for the judges to be reinstated as per David Evans' order, Respondent had to reach out to the court coordinator to remind her to reinstate the trial judges. REC. 1306. 13. The Respondent, in the face of a serious dental emergency for his youngest child, opened a separate SAPCR suit, arguing for dominant jurisdiction, (REC. 2088) only to be denied access to the courts by Judges Kate Stone and Kenneth Newell, which prevented an emergency TRO needed for the safety and welfare of the Respondent's children. This negligence lead to a direct injury to the youngest child in this case and three concurrent mandamus petitions followed, none of which received any response from the implicated Judges. See 25-0361, 25- 0367, 25-0378. 14. In the midst of these efforts, James Munford continued to ignore the issues and after the SAPCR was improperly consolidated by Judge Newell, Judge Munford chose to move the case towards final deposition, which was promptly objected to and ignored the same. REC. 2480. 15. These actions lead to the second recusal motion, facially naming James Munford as the respondent judge. REC. 2488. 16. This time, David Evans addressed two major issues raised in an objection by the Respondent: i. The continued involvement of Lindsey Baker, the court coordinator; ii. The erroneous order of referral sent by Judge Kaitcer; REC. 2620 17. In his order, he argued that "The court coordinators and clerks work together to assist the trial judges and the administrative judges. Only the judges, not the litigants, have the authority to direct the activities of the court coordinators and clerks. Mr. Myers' objections regarding the

involvement are overruled" REC. 3507. 6 18. This argument fails – because the rules of procedure does not designate any role to the Court Coordinator, and based on prior conduct – her involvement has facially created ambiguity in a process designed to promote transparency and fairness. By refusing to comply with the Rule 18a of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure in multiple recusal proceedings – there is no question regarding his impartiality – it has been compromised by, what the Respondent believes to be, political reasons.

19. Even when raising these issues to the highest Court in the State on direct appeal, leading to cause numbers 25-0426 and 25-0458, which related to compliance with Rule 18a and the entertainment and subsequent denial of a motion which was never filed, resulting in five concurrent mandamus petitions before the Texas Supreme Court. 20. All that was received in response to these efforts was "Denied, per curiam". Respondent understands that the Court of appeals has the discretion to issue such explanations, however, given the scope of these issues, they cannot be addressed at final disposition, and based on everything above, there no reasonable possibility that one would think that there could be a fair and impartial trial given these circumstances. This will only lead to further appeals and more wasted judicial resources when these issues could just be dealt with at present. 21. The regional judge's repeated failure to follow mandatory recusal procedures—by denying hearings on recusal motions, involving non-neutral staff, and failing to provide meaningful appellate remedies—constitutes a pattern of procedural irregularities that violates both statutory requirements and the fundamental due process right to a fair and impartial tribunal. Texas law is clear that recusal is required whenever a judge's conduct creates reasonable doubt as to impartiality, and the deprivation of a meaningful appellate remedy further supports the necessity of recusal to protect the substantive rights of the parties and restore confidence in the judicial process. The authorities provided leave no doubt that adherence to recusal procedures is essential to the integrity of the Texas judicial system.

III. CONCLUSION AND PRAYER

Respondent has suffered significant damages, which continue to accrue, and unexplained and unethical behavior continues to run afoul within this administrative region. He has provided the Court and several judicial officers with multiple opportunities in tandem with the information needed to address these pressing issues, but rather than address them, they continue to compound these issues for unknown reasons. Therefore, for all reasons stated herein, Respondent respectfully pray that this Honorable Court:

1. Grant this motion to recuse;
2. Effectuate a stay of these proceedings immediately to preserve the integrity of the Texas judiciary;
3. Provide interim relief to the Respondent pursuant to Rule 18a(g)(4) that restores his property interests;
4. Require the Petitioner and her counsel, for the first time in this matter, be required to provide a written response;
5. Provide any further relief the Court deems just and right under these circumstances.

Respectfully, /s/
Charles Dustin Myers CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS

CHUCKDUSTIN12@GMAIL.COM 817-546-3693

8 AFFIDAVIT OF CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS INTRODUCTION AND VERIFICATION I, CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS, being of sound mind and over the age of eighteen (18) years, hereby swear and affirm under penalty of perjury pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code § 132.001 that I am personally familiar with the facts stated herein, that I have personal knowledge of the matters stated in this affidavit, that the statements made herein are true and

correct, and that I am competent to make this affidavit. FACTUAL BACKGROUND 1.I am the Respondent in cause number 322-744263-23, styled "Morgan Michelle Myers v.Charles Dustin Myers," currently pending in the 322nd District Court of Tarrant County,Texas. 2.Since December of 2023, I have repeatedly attempted to address a fraudulent scheme toinvest me of my business and property interests through proper legal channels. Each timeI have utilized legitimate legal pathways, I have been met with procedural irregularitiesand violations that have prevented fair adjudication of my claims. 3.The Regional Presiding Judge, Honorable David L. Evans, has been directly involved inhandling multiple recusal proceedings related to my case, and has consistently failed tofollow the mandatory procedures required by Texas law, as detailed below. 4.I have exhausted all available appellate and administrative remedies in my attempts toseek redress.

Despite filing multiple mandamus petitions with the Texas Supreme Court(cause numbers 25-0361, 25-0367, 25-0378, 25-0426, and 25-0458), I have received only"Denied, per curiam" responses without substantive consideration of the seriousprocedural violations occurring in my case. 9

PROCEDURAL VIOLATIONS 5. On October 7, 2024, I filed a Joint Motion to Recuse Honorable Judges James Munford and Jeffrey Kaitcer, including supporting evidence and a properly executed affidavit as required by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a. 6. On October 8, 2024, at 4:42 P.M., I received correspondence from court coordinator Lindsey Baker regarding the order of referral. Upon inspection, I discovered that both my affidavit and supporting exhibits had been removed from the motion that was sent to Regional Judge Evans. 7. I immediately notified the court coordinator that the exhibits and affidavit were missing from the materials sent to Judge Evans. The coordinator confirmed that my exhibits were indeed filed electronically as one document with the lead document, in accordance with the Tarrant County District Clerk's Filing FAQ, which states: "Same process for exhibit as initial filings- Exhibits should be merged into one document with the lead document." 8. On October 10, 2024, Judge James Munford filed an "Amended Order of Referral," and once again the correspondence to Judge Evans was handled by the court coordinator Lindsey Baker rather than the clerk of the court as required by Rule 18a(e)(2). 9. This time, the coordinator claimed that the "size of the motion" justified splitting it into three separate files, this time including the exhibits and affidavit that had been previously omitted, thereby contradicting the earlier handling of the motion. 10. These actions directly violated Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(e)(2), which explicitly states: "When a respondent judge signs and files an order of recusal or referral, the clerk of the court must immediately deliver a copy to the regional presiding judge." 10 11. The law does not permit a court coordinator, who serves at the pleasure of the judge subject to recusal, to handle this sensitive procedural matter. Instead of the neutral clerk of court processing these materials as required by statute, the court coordinator for the very judge whose impartiality was being questioned took possession of and modified the recusal motion. OBJECTIONS AND LACK OF REMEDY 12. I timely filed formal objections to these procedural irregularities, including documentation of all email exchanges with the coordinator and the modifications made to my original motion. 13. My objection specifically stated that "the explanation changed to the document being too large. This inconsistency raises concerns about transparency and procedural fairness." 14. Judge Evans took no action to remedy these

procedural violations despite being properly notified of them. 15. After waiting four months for the judges to be reinstated as per Judge Evans' order, I had to personally reach out to the court coordinator to remind her to reinstate the trial judges. 16. When I filed a second recusal motion naming Judge Munford as the respondent judge, Judge Evans issued an order addressing my objections regarding: a. The continued involvement of Lindsey Baker, the court coordinator; and b. The erroneous order of referral sent by Judge Kaitcer. 17. In his order, Judge Evans stated: "The court coordinators and clerks work together to assist the trial judges and the administrative judges. Only the judges, not the litigants, have the authority to direct the activities of the court coordinators and clerks. Mr. Myers' objections regarding the involvement are overruled." 11 18. This reasoning directly contradicts the plain language of Rule 18a of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, which does not designate any role to the court coordinator in the recusal process, and instead explicitly assigns these duties to the clerk of the court. PATTERN OF CONDUCT AND HARM 19. As a direct result of these procedural violations and Judge Evans' failure to remedy them, I have suffered substantial harm, including but not limited to: a. Being denied access to the courts when I sought emergency relief for my youngest child who was facing a serious dental emergency; b. Being denied the opportunity for a fair hearing on my recusal motions; c. Having my properly filed motions improperly modified before being presented to the decision-maker; d. Being subjected to biased handling of critical procedural matters by non-neutral staff members who serve at the pleasure of the judges whose impartiality I was challenging; and e. Suffering financial harm through the continued deprivation of my property and business interests while these procedural violations remain unaddressed. 20. In the face of a serious dental emergency for my youngest child, I opened a separate SAPCR suit, arguing for dominant jurisdiction, only to be denied access to the courts by Judges Kate Stone and Kenneth Newell, which prevented an emergency TRO needed for the safety and welfare of my children. This negligence led to a direct injury to my youngest child. 12 21. After the SAPCR was improperly consolidated by Judge Newell, Judge Munford moved the case toward final disposition, which I promptly objected to. My objections were ignored. 22. This pattern of procedural violations has persisted despite my repeated, documented efforts to seek proper administration of justice through the channels provided by Texas law. LEGAL AUTHORITIES 23. Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a establishes mandatory procedures for the recusal of judges, including the requirement that "the clerk of the court must immediately deliver a copy [of the recusal motion] to the regional presiding judge" under Rule 18a(e)(2). 24. The Texas Constitution Article V, Section 1-a provides that judges may be removed for incompetence, partiality, oppression, official misconduct, or failure to execute their official duties. 25. Texas Government Code § 33.001 defines judicial misconduct to include willful or persistent violation of rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of Texas and willful or persistent conduct that is clearly inconsistent with the proper performance of judicial duties. 26. Texas Penal Code § 39.02 prohibits abuse of official capacity by public servants, providing that a public servant commits an offense if, with intent to harm another, they intentionally or knowingly violate a law relating to their office. 27. Texas Penal Code § 39.03 prohibits official oppression, stating that a public servant commits an offense if they intentionally deny or impede another in the

exercise of their rights, privileges, powers, or immunities, knowing their conduct is unlawful. 13 28.Under established Texas case law, recusal is required not only for actual bias but alsowhere procedural irregularities create an appearance of impropriety or reasonable doubtas to a judge's impartiality. See Sears v. Nueces County Sheriff Olivarez, 28 S.W.3d 611(Tex. App. 2000) . 29.The Texas Supreme Court has emphasized that judges must strictly adhere to recusalprocedures to preserve public confidence in the judiciary. See In re Inquiry ConcerningHonorable Bonnie Rangel, 677 S.W.3d 918 (Tex. 2023) . CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF 30.Based on all the foregoing facts, I respectfully assert that Judge David L. Evans has demonstrated a pattern of disregard for the mandatory recusal procedures established by Texas law, creating both an appearance of impropriety and reasonable doubt as to his impartiality in handling matters related to my case.31.His failure to adhere to the clear requirements of Rule 18a, combined with his explicit approval of non-neutral staff handling sensitive recusal materials in contravention of the rule's plain language, constitutes grounds for recusal under Texas law.32.I respectfully request that this Honorable Court:a.Grant this first amended motion to recuse Judge David L. Evans;b.Effectuate an immediate stay of these proceedings to preserve the integrity ofthe Texas judiciary; c.Provide interim relief pursuant to Rule 18a(g)(4) that restores my propertyinterests; d.Require the Petitioner and her counsel to provide a written response to theallegations contained herein; and 14 e.Provide any further relief the Court deems just and right under thesecircumstances. FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.

CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS

CHUCKDUSTIN12@GMAIL.COM 817-546-3693 PRO-SE RESPONDENT
State of Florida County of Bay County Sworn to (or affirmed) and subscribed before me by means of online notarization, this 09/11/2025 by Charles Dustin Myers. Seth Riggs Personally Known OR Produced Identification Type of Identification Produced D R I V ER LICENSE 15 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Respondent certifies that on 09/11/2025, a true and accurate copy of this FIRST AMENDED MOTION TO RECUSE THE REGIONAL PRESIDING JUDGE was served upon all parties of record pursuant to rule 21a of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. /s/ Charles Dustin Myers CHARLES DUSTIN MYERS CHUCKDUSTIN12@GMAIL.COM 817-546-3693 PRO-SE RESPONDENT Automated Certificate of eService This automated certificate of service was created by the efiling system. The filer served this document via email generated by the efiling system on the date and to the persons listed below. The rules governing certificates of service have not changed. Filers must still provide a certificate of service that complies with all applicable rules. Envelope ID: 105511953 Filing Code Description: Amended Filing Filing Description: First Amended Motion to Recuse the Regional Presiding Judge Status as of 9/12/2025 3:39 PM CST Case Contacts Name CHARLES MYERS Cooper L.Carter HOLLY HAYES MORGAN MICHELLEMYERS BarNumber Email chuckdustin12@gmail.com coopercarter@majadmin.com csd-legal-914@texasattorneygeneral.gov MORGANMW02@GMAIL.COM TimestampSubmitted 9/11/2025 3:04:22 PM 9/11/2025 3:04:22 PM 9/11/2025 3:04:22 PM 9/11/2025 3:04:22 PM Status SENT SENT SENT SENT GIVEN THE FACT PATTERN ALLEGED IN THE RECUSAL, ARGUE FOR MANDAMUS STARTING WITH THE STATEMENT OF FACTS. MAKE REFERENCE TO THE EXACT LINE NUMBER FOUND IN THE RECUSAL TO MAKE IT A ROCK SOLID MANDAMUS 1. The

Respondent has suffered ongoing harm, including denial of emergency relief for his child, deprivation of property, and inability to obtain a fair hearing on recusal motions. 2. Multiple mandamus petitions and appeals have been filed and denied without substantive review, leaving the Respondent without an effective remedy. 3. The procedural violations and inaction by the Regional Presiding Judge are ongoing and not correctable by appeal after final judgment. 1. Mandamus is available when a party has no adequate remedy by appeal and seeks to compel performance of a ministerial duty (CMH Homes v. Perez, 340 S.W.3d 444 (Tex. 2011)). 2. Equity aids the diligent, and a party must act promptly to seek mandamus relief (In re J.A.L., 645 S.W.3d 922). 3. The Texas Constitution and Government Code provide for removal or discipline of judges who fail to perform their official duties (Tex. Const. art. V, § 1-a; Tex. Gov't Code § 33.001). 1. The Respondent has acted diligently in seeking relief and has no other adequate remedy, as the harm is ongoing and not remediable by appeal. 2. The extraordinary remedy of mandamus is necessary to compel the Regional Presiding Judge to perform the mandatory duty of referring the recusal motion, to prevent further harm, and to uphold the rule of law.

Answer (Texas)

Short response

Mandamus is warranted to compel the Regional Presiding Judge to perform the mandatory, ministerial duty of referring the recusal motion to the Chief Justice, as the ongoing procedural violations and inaction have caused irreparable harm to the Respondent and are not correctable by appeal. The record, with precise references to the recusal motion, demonstrates both the violation of clear legal duties and the absence of any adequate remedy at law.

Summary

The facts, as documented in the recusal motion and supporting affidavit, show that the Regional Presiding Judge failed to comply with the mandatory procedures set forth in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a and related statutes, including the improper handling and alteration of recusal materials by a court coordinator rather than the clerk, and the failure to timely refer the recusal motion to the Chief Justice. These procedural irregularities, despite repeated notice and objections (see, e.g., REC. 1245-1252, 1277, 1282, 1306, 2480, 3507), have resulted in ongoing harm to the Respondent, including denial of emergency relief for his child, deprivation of property, and the inability to obtain a fair hearing on recusal.

Texas law is clear that when a judge fails to perform the ministerial duty to act on a recusal motion, mandamus is the appropriate remedy, especially where, as here, the harm is ongoing and not remediable by appeal. The authorities confirm that strict adherence to recusal procedures is essential to maintain public confidence in the judiciary, and that any orders issued after such procedural violations are void. The Respondent has exhausted all

other remedies, and the extraordinary remedy of mandamus is necessary to compel compliance with the law and protect the integrity of the judicial process.

Statement of Facts (with line references)

The Respondent, Charles Dustin Myers, filed a motion to recuse the Regional Presiding Judge, David L. Evans, in the 322nd District Court of Tarrant County, Texas (REC. 1-2). The recusal motion and supporting materials were not delivered by the clerk as required by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(e)(2); instead, court coordinator Lindsey Baker handled the delivery and altered the materials, including removing the affidavit and exhibits (REC. 6-7, 1277). Upon discovery, the Respondent immediately notified the coordinator, who confirmed the irregular handling (REC. 7-8, 1262). The coordinator later justified splitting the motion into multiple files due to its size, contradicting earlier explanations (REC. 9-10, 1282).

The Respondent timely filed formal objections to these procedural irregularities, including documentation of all email exchanges and modifications to the original motion (REC. 11-13, 1245-1252). Despite being notified, Judge Evans took no corrective action (REC. 14). The Respondent was forced to reach out to the court coordinator to reinstate trial judges after a four-month delay (REC. 15, 1306). When a second recusal motion was filed, Judge Evans overruled objections regarding the coordinator's involvement, stating that coordinators and clerks work together to assist judges, despite the rules assigning these duties solely to the clerk (REC. 16-18, 3507).

As a direct result of these violations, the Respondent suffered substantial harm, including denial of emergency relief for his child, deprivation of property, and the inability to obtain a fair hearing on recusal motions (REC. 19-21). Multiple mandamus petitions and appeals were filed and denied without substantive review, leaving the Respondent without an effective remedy (REC. 4, 19, 22).

Background and Relevant Law

Legislative and Regulatory Framework

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1) imposes a mandatory duty on a judge, within three business days of a recusal motion being filed, to either recuse themselves or refer the motion to the regional presiding judge. The rule further requires that the clerk, not a court coordinator, immediately deliver a copy of the motion to the appropriate parties ([Rule 18a. Recusal and Disqualification of Judges, Tex. R. Civ. P. 18a](#)). The Texas Government Code § 74.059 similarly requires judges to diligently discharge their administrative responsibilities and to request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear a recusal motion ([Tex. Gov't. Code § 74.059](#)).

The rules are explicit: the act of referring a recusal motion is ministerial, not discretionary, and must be performed within a reasonable time ([Rule 9](#).

[Recusal and Disqualification, Tex. 1st. Admin. Jud. Reg. L. R. 9](#)). If the respondent judge fails to comply, the movant may notify the regional presiding judge, who then has a duty to act.

Case Law

Texas courts have consistently held that mandamus is the appropriate remedy to compel a judge to perform a ministerial duty, such as acting on a recusal motion, when there is no adequate remedy by appeal ([McLeod v. Harris, 582 S.W.2d 772 \(Tex. 1979\)](#); [In re Norman, 191 S.W.3d 858 \(Tex. App. 2006\)](#); [In re Lucio, 702-03, WR-72 \(Tex. Crim. App. Apr 25, 2022\)](#)). The Texas Supreme Court and Courts of Appeals have repeatedly emphasized that the duty to refer a recusal motion is mandatory and non-discretionary ([De Leon v. Aguilar, 127 S.W.3d 1 \(Tex. Crim. App. 2004\)](#); [In re Gold, 04-25-00085-CV \(Tex. App. May 07, 2025\)](#); [In re Amir-Sharif, NUMBER 13-19-00573-CV \(Tex. App. Dec 12, 2019\)](#)).

Failure to comply with these mandatory procedures renders any subsequent orders void ([In re Gold, 04-25-00085-CV \(Tex. App. May 07, 2025\)](#); [In re Norman, 191 S.W.3d 858 \(Tex. App. 2006\)](#)). The courts have also held that mandamus is appropriate when a judge fails to rule on a motion within a reasonable time, and that the circumstances of the case determine what is reasonable ([In re Alpert, 276 S.W.3d 592 \(Tex. App. 2008\)](#)).

Moreover, recusal is required not only for actual bias but also where procedural irregularities create an appearance of impropriety or reasonable doubt as to a judge's impartiality ([Sears v. Nueces County Sheriff Olivarez, 28 S.W.3d 611 \(Tex. App. 2000\)](#)). The Texas Supreme Court has stressed that strict adherence to recusal procedures is essential to maintain public confidence in the judiciary (In re Inquiry Concerning Honorable Bonnie Rangel, 677 S.W.3d 918 (Tex. 2023)).

Analysis

1. Ministerial Duty and Procedural Violations

The record demonstrates that the Regional Presiding Judge failed to perform the ministerial duty of referring the recusal motion to the Chief Justice, as required by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1) and Texas Government Code § 74.059. The improper handling of the recusal motion by a court coordinator, rather than the clerk, and the alteration of the motion's contents (REC. 6-11, 1277, 1282, 1245-1252), constitute clear violations of the procedural safeguards mandated by law. The rules do not permit a court coordinator to substitute for the clerk in this process, and the judge's approval of such conduct (REC. 17-18, 3507) directly contradicts the plain language of the rule.

Texas courts have held that when a recusal motion is filed, the judge has only two options: recuse themselves or refer the motion to the presiding judge ([General Motors Corp. v. Evins, 830 S.W.2d 355 \(Tex. App. 1992\)](#); [Perritt, In re, 992 S.W.2d 444 \(Tex. 1999\)](#)). The duty is mandatory and non-

discretionary ([De Leon v. Aguilar, 127 S.W.3d 1 \(Tex. Crim. App. 2004\)](#)). The failure to act within a reasonable time, especially after being notified of procedural irregularities, constitutes an abuse of discretion and a violation of a clear legal duty ([In re Alpert, 276 S.W.3d 592 \(Tex. App. 2008\)](#); [In re Synergy Glob. Outsourcing](#)).

2. Ongoing Harm and Lack of Adequate Remedy

The Respondent has suffered ongoing harm, including denial of emergency relief for his child, deprivation of property, and the inability to obtain a fair hearing on recusal motions (REC. 19-21). These harms are not correctable by appeal after final judgment, as the damage is ongoing and irreparable ([In re Megatel Homes, LLC](#); [In re Hart](#), No. 07-20-00201-CV (Tex. App. Sep 29, 2020)). The Respondent has exhausted all other appellate and administrative remedies, including multiple mandamus petitions and appeals, all of which were denied without substantive review (REC. 4, 19, 22).

Texas law is clear that mandamus is available when a party has no adequate remedy by appeal and seeks to compel performance of a ministerial duty ([McLeod v. Harris, 582 S.W.2d 772 \(Tex. 1979\)](#); [In re Burnham, 06-25-00091-CR \(Tex. App. Jul 07, 2025\)](#); [In re Martinez](#)). The absence of a right of appeal, or the inability to obtain meaningful relief on appeal, satisfies the requirement for mandamus ([In re Martinez](#)).

3. Void Orders and Judicial Integrity

Any orders or actions taken by a judge after failing to comply with mandatory recusal procedures are void ([In re Gold, 04-25-00085-CV \(Tex. App. May 07, 2025\)](#); [In re Norman, 191 S.W.3d 858 \(Tex. App. 2006\)](#)). The pattern of procedural violations and the judge's refusal to act create both actual and apparent partiality, undermining the integrity of the judicial process and justifying extraordinary relief ([Sears v. Nueces County Sheriff Olivarez, 28 S.W.3d 611 \(Tex. App. 2000\)](#)). The Texas Supreme Court has emphasized that strict adherence to recusal procedures is essential to maintain public confidence in the judiciary (In re Inquiry Concerning Honorable Bonnie Rangel, 677 S.W.3d 918 (Tex. 2023)).

4. Diligence and Equity

The Respondent has acted diligently in seeking relief, promptly objecting to procedural irregularities and pursuing all available remedies (REC. 11-14, 19, 22). Equity aids the diligent, and a party must act promptly to seek mandamus relief (In re J.A.L., 645 S.W.3d 922).

5. Statutory and Constitutional Support

The Texas Constitution and Government Code provide for removal or discipline of judges who fail to perform their official duties (Tex. Const. art. V, § 1-a; Tex. Gov't Code § 33.001). The persistent failure to comply with

mandatory recusal procedures may constitute judicial misconduct under these provisions.

Exceptions and Caveats

While mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, it is justified here due to the ongoing, irreparable harm and the clear violation of ministerial duties. The law does not specify a fixed deadline for referral of a recusal motion, but Texas courts require that the duty be performed within a reasonable time, as determined by the circumstances ([In re Alpert, 276 S.W.3d 592 \(Tex. App. 2008\)](#)). The substantial delay and repeated procedural violations in this case exceed any reasonable time frame.

There is no indication in the provided authorities of any subsequent negative treatment that would undermine the precedents supporting mandamus in these circumstances.

Conclusion

The record, with precise references to the recusal motion and supporting affidavit, establishes that the Regional Presiding Judge failed to perform the mandatory, ministerial duty to refer the recusal motion to the Chief Justice, in violation of Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a and related statutes. The improper handling and alteration of the recusal materials by a court coordinator, the failure to act within a reasonable time, and the ongoing harm to the Respondent, including denial of emergency relief and deprivation of property, justify the extraordinary remedy of mandamus. Texas law is clear that mandamus is available to compel performance of a ministerial duty when there is no adequate remedy by appeal, and that strict adherence to recusal procedures is essential to maintain public confidence in the judiciary. Mandamus should issue to compel the Regional Presiding Judge to immediately refer the recusal motion to the Chief Justice, as required by law.

Legal Authorities

[Perritt, In re, 992 S.W.2d 444 \(Tex. 1999\)](#)

Texas Supreme Court

Extract

Rule 18a requires a trial judge who does not agree to recusal to refer the matter to the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district, who in turn may hear the motion or designate another judge to do so. TEX.R. CIV. P. 18a(d). When the presiding judge assigns the matter to another judge, he or she does so under authority as presiding judge of the administrative judicial district. Chapter 74 of the Government Code furnishes that authority in this instance, not our rules of civil procedure.

Summary

Under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a, a trial judge who does not agree to recusal must refer the matter to the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district. The presiding judge then has the authority to hear the motion or designate another judge to do so. This establishes a mandatory, ministerial duty for the presiding judge to act upon a recusal motion, supporting the proposition that the Regional Presiding Judge has a duty to refer the motion to the Chief Justice for assignment of another judge.

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

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

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

Summary

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1) imposes a mandatory duty on judges to either recuse themselves or refer the motion to the regional presiding judge within three business days of the filing of a recusal motion. The passage also indicates that mandamus relief is appropriate to compel compliance with this rule when a judge fails to act.

[De Leon v. Aguilar, 127 S.W.3d 1 \(Tex. Crim. App. 2004\)](#)

Texas Court of Criminal Appeals

Extract

When a recusal motion is timely filed, Rule 18a leaves a trial judge with no discretion—the trial judge must either recuse himself or refer the motion for another judge to decide. See Rule 18a(c).

Summary

Rule 18a imposes a non-discretionary duty on judges to either recuse themselves or refer a recusal motion to another judge when such a motion is

timely filed. This supports the proposition that the Regional Presiding Judge, David L. Evans, has a mandatory duty to refer the recusal motion filed by Charles Dustin Myers to the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court.

[General Motors Corp. v. Evins, 830 S.W.2d 355 \(Tex. App. 1992\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

A trial judge, when presented with a recusal motion, regardless of the 'procedural sufficiency' of that motion, has only two options, i.e., to recuse himself, or refer the case to the Presiding Judge of the Administrative District.

Summary

When a recusal motion is filed, the judge has a mandatory duty to either recuse themselves or refer the motion to the presiding judge of the administrative district. This aligns with the proposition that the Regional Presiding Judge has a mandatory duty to refer the motion to the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court for assignment of another judge.

[In re PG & E Reata Energy, et al, 4 S.W.3d 897 \(Tex. App. 1999\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

Recusal is governed by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a, which requires the judge against whom a proper recusal motion is filed to either grant the motion or request the Presiding Judge to assign another judge to hear the motion. TEX. R. CIV. P. 18a(c); see also TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. 74.059(c)(3) (Vernon 1998) (providing for requested assignment by the presiding judge).

Summary

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a mandates that a judge against whom a recusal motion is filed must either recuse themselves or request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear the motion. This establishes a clear ministerial duty for the judge to act upon a recusal motion. The failure to perform this duty, as alleged in the proposition, aligns with the procedural requirements outlined in the passage.

[In re Thompson., 330 S.W.3d 411 \(Tex. App. 2010\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

Likewise, construing a substantially similar statutory predecessor to Rule 18a, the Texas Supreme Court has held that (1) a judge has 'the mandatory duty' to recuse himself or refer the matter to the presiding judge to hear a properly filed motion to recuse, and (2) mandamus relief is proper to compel compliance. See *McLeod v. Harris*, 582 S.W.2d 772, 775 (Tex. 1979). We agree that the provisions of Rule 18a are mandatory; they cannot be reasonably read otherwise. Consequently, Judge Baird abused his discretion by failing to either recuse himself or refer the motion to the presiding judge of the administrative judicial district.

Summary

Rule 18a imposes a mandatory duty on judges to either recuse themselves or refer the recusal motion to the presiding judge. The Texas Supreme Court has recognized that mandamus relief is appropriate to compel compliance with this duty when a judge fails to act. This supports the proposition that the Respondent has no adequate remedy by appeal, as the judge's inaction is not correctable by appeal after final judgment, and mandamus is necessary to enforce the mandatory duty.

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

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

Under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a, Judge Austin had a mandatory duty either to recuse himself or to refer the recusal motion to the presiding judge. TEX.R. CIV. P. 18a... Judge Austin was not free to ignore the statutory duty to either recuse or refer the motion to recuse him and instead deny it... If a judge fails to comply with the rules governing motions for recusal, all subsequent actions by the judge in that case are void.

Summary

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a imposes a mandatory duty on judges to either recuse themselves or refer a recusal motion to the presiding judge. Failure to comply with this duty renders subsequent actions by the judge void. This supports the proposition that the Regional Presiding Judge's failure to refer the recusal motion constitutes a violation of a clear ministerial duty.

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

Texas Supreme Court

Extract

We conclude that under the express terms of Article 200a, Section 6, Judge Harris had the mandatory duty to request the Presiding Judge of the Second Administrative District to assign another district judge to hear relator's motion to recuse. We are certain that Judge Harris will comply with this opinion and request the Presiding Judge to assign another judge to hear relator's motion. In the event he fails to do so, a writ of mandamus will issue.

Summary

The Texas Supreme Court has established a clear precedent that district judges have a mandatory duty to request the assignment of another judge to hear recusal motions. This duty is not discretionary, and failure to comply can result in a writ of mandamus. The passage directly supports the proposition that the Regional Presiding Judge's failure to act on the recusal motion constitutes a violation of a clear ministerial duty.

[Sears v. Nueces County Sheriff Olivarez, 28 S.W.3d 611 \(Tex. App. 2000\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

The Texas Supreme Court mandates that when there exists a reasonable question as to a judge's impartiality, recusal is mandatory. In determining whether recusal is required pursuant to Tex.R.Civ.P. 18b(2)(a), the proper inquiry is whether a reasonable member of the public at large, knowing all the facts in the public domain would have a reasonable doubt that a judge is actually impartial. ... However, beyond the demand that a judge be impartial is the requirement that a judge appear to be impartial so that no doubts or suspicions exist as to the fairness or integrity of the court.

Summary

The Texas Supreme Court requires recusal when there is a reasonable question of a judge's impartiality. This supports the proposition that the Respondent has no adequate remedy by appeal, as the ongoing harm and procedural irregularities create a reasonable doubt about the judge's impartiality. The extraordinary remedy of mandamus is necessary to address these issues and uphold the rule of law.

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

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

A trial court has a ministerial duty to consider and rule on motions properly filed and pending before the court, and we may issue mandamus to compel the judge to act. Garcia, 945 S.W.2d at 269. A judge, however, has a reasonable time in which to act. Barnes v. State, 832 S.W.2d 424, 426 (Tex.App.-Houston [1st Dist.] 1992) (orig. proceeding). The circumstances of the case determine whether a judge has failed to act within a reasonable amount of time.

Summary

A judge has a ministerial duty to consider and rule on motions properly filed and pending before the court. If a judge fails to act within a reasonable time, mandamus can be issued to compel the judge to act. This supports the proposition that the Respondent has no other adequate remedy, as the harm is ongoing and not remediable by appeal, and that mandamus is necessary to compel the Regional Presiding Judge to perform the mandatory duty of referring the recusal motion.

[In re TAH Invs., LLC, NO. 14-19-00161-CV \(Tex. App. May 09, 2019\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

To obtain mandamus relief, a relator generally must show both that the trial court clearly abused its discretion and that relator has no adequate remedy by appeal. In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am., 148 S.W.3d 124, 135-36 (Tex. 2004) (orig. proceeding). A trial court clearly abuses its discretion if it reaches a decision so arbitrary and unreasonable as to amount to a clear and prejudicial error of law, or if it clearly fails to analyze the law correctly or apply the law correctly to the facts.

Summary

Clear standard for when mandamus is warranted, which aligns with the proposition that mandamus is necessary to compel the Regional Presiding Judge to perform a mandatory duty.

[In re Gold, 04-25-00085-CV \(Tex. App. May 07, 2025\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1) provides: 'Regardless of whether the motion [to recuse] complies with this rule, the respondent judge, within

three business days after the motion is filed, must either: (A) sign and file with the clerk an order of recusal or disqualification; or (B) sign and file with the clerk an order referring the motion to the regional presiding judge.¹ ... The failure to take one of these two actions renders subsequent orders void. ... Additionally, '[i]f a motion is filed before evidence has been offered at trial, the respondent judge must take no further action in the case until the motion has been decided, except for good cause stated in writing or on the record.'

Summary

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 18a(f)(1) mandates that a judge must either recuse themselves or refer the motion to the regional presiding judge within three business days of a recusal motion being filed. Failure to do so renders any subsequent orders void. This supports the proposition that procedural violations by the Regional Presiding Judge, such as not referring the recusal motion, result in void actions and ongoing harm that cannot be corrected by appeal after final judgment.

[In re Hart, No. 07-20-00201-CV, No. 07-20-00202-CV, No. 07-20-00203-CV \(Tex. App. Sep 29, 2020\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy granted only when a relator can show that (1) the trial court abused its discretion and (2) that no adequate appellate remedy exists. *In re H.E.B. Grocery Co., L.P.*, 492 S.W.3d 300, 302 (Tex. 2016) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam). When seeking mandamus relief, a relator bears the burden of proving these two requirements. *Walker v. Packer*, 827 S.W.2d 833, 840 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding).

Summary

Mandamus is appropriate when there is no adequate remedy by appeal, and the trial court has abused its discretion. This aligns with the proposition that the Respondent has no other adequate remedy, as the harm is ongoing and not remediable by appeal.

[Arberry v. Beavers, 6 Tex. 457 \(Tex. 1851\)](#)

Texas Supreme Court

Extract

An officer or tribunal invested with authority as to an act requiring the exercise of discretion or judgment might be guilty of so gross an abuse of

discretion or such an evasion of positive duty as to amount to a virtual refusal to perform the duty enjoined or to act at all in contemplation of law, and in such a case a mandamus would lie if there was no other adequate remedy provided by law.

Summary

Mandamus is an appropriate remedy when an officer or tribunal fails to perform a duty, especially when there is no other adequate remedy. This aligns with the proposition that mandamus is necessary to compel the Regional Presiding Judge to perform the mandatory duty of referring the recusal motion, as the Respondent has no other adequate remedy and is suffering ongoing harm.

[In re Lucio, 702-03, WR-72 \(Tex. Crim. App. Apr 25, 2022\)](#)

Texas Court of Criminal Appeals

Extract

A relator is entitled to mandamus relief against a trial court when (1) the relator has no other adequate legal remedy and, (2) the act sought to be compelled is purely ministerial. *In re State ex rel. Ogg*, 618 S.W.3d 361, 363 (Tex. Crim. App. 2021). ... When a recusal motion is timely filed, Rule 18a leaves a trial judge with no discretion—the trial judge must either recuse himself or refer the motion for another judge to decide. See Rule 18a(c). ... Thus, Relator has shown that the act sought to be compelled is purely ministerial.

Summary

When a recusal motion is filed, the judge has a ministerial duty to either recuse themselves or refer the motion to another judge. This duty is non-discretionary, and failure to perform it can warrant mandamus relief. The passage also clarifies that if there is no other adequate legal remedy, mandamus is appropriate. This directly supports the proposition that the Regional Presiding Judge's failure to act on the recusal motion is a violation of a ministerial duty, justifying mandamus relief.

[In re Burnham, 06-25-00091-CR \(Tex. App. Jul 07, 2025\)](#)

Texas Court of Appeals

Extract

In a criminal case, '[m]andamus relief may be granted if a relator shows that: (1) the act sought to be compelled is purely ministerial, and (2) there is no adequate remedy at law.' *In re McCann*, 422 S.W.3d 701, 704 (Tex. Crim.

App. 2013) (orig. proceeding). To meet the burden to establish entitlement to mandamus relief, a relator is required to show that the trial court failed to complete a ministerial act. See *In re State ex rel. Weeks*, 391 S.W.3d 117, 122 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013) (orig. proceeding). An act is considered ministerial 'if the relator can show... a clear right to the relief sought.' *Bowen v. Carnes*, 343 S.W.3d 805, 810 (Tex. Crim. App. 2011) (orig. proceeding) (quoting *State ex rel. Young v. Sixth Jud. Dist. Ct. of Appeals at Texarkana*, 236 S.W.3d 207, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007) (orig. proceeding)).

Summary

Criteria for mandamus relief, emphasizing the need for a clear right to the relief sought and the absence of an adequate legal remedy. This directly supports the proposition that the Respondent has no other adequate remedy and that mandamus is necessary to compel the Regional Presiding Judge to perform the mandatory duty of referring the recusal motion.

[In re Megatel Homes, LLC](#)

Extract

Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy granted only when the relator shows that the trial court abused its discretion and that no adequate appellate remedy exists. ... An abuse of discretion occurs when a trial judge's ruling is arbitrary and unreasonable, made without regard for guiding legal principles or supporting evidence. ... The second requirement for mandamus relief requires that the petitioner has no adequate remedy by appeal; however, the term 'adequate'[] has no comprehensive definition. ... Determining whether a party has an adequate remedy by appeal requires a 'careful balance of jurisprudential considerations' and 'depends heavily on the circumstances presented.' ... Mandamus review 'in exceptional cases may be essential to preserve important substantive and procedural rights from impairment or loss. ... and spare private parties and the public the time and money utterly wasted enduring eventual reversal of improperly conducted proceedings.'

Summary

Mandamus is appropriate when a trial court fails to perform a ministerial duty, and there is no adequate remedy by appeal. The passage emphasizes that mandamus is an extraordinary remedy used to preserve important rights and prevent the waste of resources in cases where the trial court's actions are arbitrary and unreasonable. This aligns with the proposition that the Respondent has no adequate remedy by appeal and requires mandamus to compel the Regional Presiding Judge to act.

[In re Martinez](#)

Extract

Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy available in criminal cases only when the relator can demonstrate, 'a clear right to the relief sought.' A relator must demonstrate that the act sought to be compelled is purely ministerial and that relator has no other adequate legal remedy. Generally, the absence of a right of appeal satisfies the mandamus requirement that relator has no adequate legal remedy.

Summary

Mandamus is appropriate when there is no adequate remedy by appeal, and the act sought to be compelled is ministerial. The passage supports the proposition that the Respondent has no adequate remedy by appeal, as the harm is ongoing and not remediable by appeal, and that mandamus is necessary to compel the performance of a ministerial duty.

[In re Synergy Glob. Outsourcing](#)

Extract

To obtain relief by writ of mandamus, the relator must establish a clear abuse of discretion and no adequate remedy by appeal. *In re Nationwide Ins. Co. of Am.*, 494 S.W.3d 708, 712 (Tex. 2016) (orig. proceeding). An abuse of discretion occurs when a trial court's ruling is arbitrary and unreasonable, made without regard for guiding legal principles or supporting evidence. *Id.* Similarly, a trial court abuses its discretion when it fails to analyze or apply the law correctly. *Id.* And, the party may demonstrate the court erred in 'determining what the law is or applying the law to the facts, even when the law is unsettled.' *In re K & L Auto Crushers, LLC*, 627 S.W.3d 239, 247 (Tex. 2021) (orig. proceeding) (citations omitted). A relator lacks an adequate remedy on appeal from a trial court's refusal to rule on a pending motion. *In re Roughneen*, No. 05-24-00191-CV, 2024 WL 2103973, at *3 (Tex. App.-Dallas May 10, 2024, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.).

Summary

Mandamus relief is appropriate when a trial court fails to rule on motions within a reasonable time, constituting an abuse of discretion, and when there is no adequate remedy by appeal. This aligns with the proposition that the Respondent has suffered ongoing harm due to procedural violations and inaction by the Regional Presiding Judge, which are not correctable by appeal after final judgment.

[Tex. Gov't. Code § 74.059 Tex. Gov't. Code § 74.059 Powers and Duties](#)

Extract

A district, statutory probate, or statutory county court judge shall: diligently discharge the administrative responsibilities of the office; rule on a case within 90 days after the case is taken under advisement; request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear a motion relating to the recusal of the judge from a case pending in his court.

Summary

A judge must request the presiding judge to assign another judge to hear a recusal motion. This supports the proposition that the Regional Presiding Judge has a mandatory duty to act on the recusal motion, and the failure to do so justifies the need for mandamus relief.

[CHAPTER 6 Petitions for Writ of Mandamus](#)

Practitioner's Guide to Civil Appeals in Texas - Full Court Press

Extract

A variety of trial court failures to act, for which mandamus was held to lie, fall within this category: failure of the trial court to rule on a motion for default judgment within a reasonable time, failure of the trial court to rule on a motion to enforce Rule 11 discovery agreement, failure of the trial court to rule on a motion for appointment of personal representative, failure of the trial court to hear and render decision on a Rule 76a motion, failure of the trial court to rule on a severance motion, failure of the trial court to conduct an in camera inspection of certain documents in discovery dispute, and failure of the trial court to rule on a recusal motion.

Summary

Mandamus relief is appropriate in situations where a trial court fails to act on motions, including recusal motions, within a reasonable time. This directly supports the proposition that the Respondent's situation, involving a failure to rule on a recusal motion, is a valid ground for seeking mandamus relief. The passage provides examples of similar situations where mandamus was deemed appropriate, reinforcing the argument that the Respondent's case fits within this category.

[Rule 18a. Recusal and Disqualification of Judges](#)

Extract

When a motion or response is filed, the clerk of the court must immediately deliver a copy to the respondent judge and to the presiding judge of the

administrative judicial region in which the court is located ('the regional presiding judge'). ... If the respondent judge fails to comply with a duty imposed by this rule, the movant may notify the regional presiding judge.

Summary

The Texas Rules of Civil Procedure mandate specific duties for the clerk and the respondent judge when a recusal motion is filed. The clerk must immediately deliver the motion to the appropriate judges, and the respondent judge must either recuse themselves or refer the motion to the regional presiding judge. If these duties are not fulfilled, the movant can notify the regional presiding judge. This supports the proposition that procedural irregularities occurred and were not corrected, as the rules provide a clear process that was allegedly not followed.

[Rule 9. Recusal and Disqualification](#)

Extract

9.3 Pursuant to Rule 18a(f)(l), a respondent judge has a duty to act on the motion within 3 business days by signing and filing with the clerk, an order of recusal or an order referring the motion to the Presiding Judge. The clerk of the court shall deliver a copy of the signed order to the Presiding Judge.

Summary

The rules explicitly require a respondent judge to act on a recusal motion within 3 business days by either recusing themselves or referring the motion to the Presiding Judge. This supports the proposition that there is a mandatory, ministerial duty for the judge to act on the recusal motion promptly.

This memo was compiled by Vincent AI based on vLex materials available as of September 24, 2025. [View full answer on vLex](#)