

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT
AMARILLO

Richard A. Dunsmore v. Management and Training Corporation, et
al.

No. 07-25-00229-CV (Tex. App.—Amarillo Mar. 30, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. 07-25-00229-CV · Decided March
30, 2026

SUMMARY

The Seventh District Court of Appeals of Texas dismissed Richard A. Dunsmore’s appeal for want of prosecution. The court held that the appellant failed to file a brief and motion for extension despite repeated directives and warnings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Parker, C.J.; Doss, J.; Yarbrough, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
DECIDED	March 30, 2026
DOCKET	07-25-00229-CV
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appellant appealed from the trial court's order of dismissal. The court of appeals dismissed the appeal for want of prosecution after appellant failed to file a brief and motion for extension despite multiple directives.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Richard A. Dunsmore v. Management and Training Corporation, et al.

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the appeal should be dismissed for want of prosecution when the appellant failed to file an appellate brief and failed to comply with repeated directives to file the brief with a motion for extension.

HOLDINGS

1. The appeal was dismissed for want of prosecution because appellant failed to file a brief and motion for extension after being given repeated notice and opportunities to comply.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution.”

“Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal for want of prosecution.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The appellant sought review of a trial-court order of dismissal. He did not timely file his appellate brief, and an attempted electronic filing was rejected because it lacked a motion for extension. Despite two subsequent appellate-court directives setting deadlines and warning of dismissal, he filed neither the required brief nor a motion for extension.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The 154th District Court of Lamb County, Texas, entered an order of dismissal. Appellant's brief was due December 29, 2025, but was not filed. After the appellate court notified appellant that the appeal was subject to dismissal and gave repeated opportunities to file a brief with a motion for extension, appellant failed to comply or communicate further. The court dismissed the appeal for want of prosecution.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In The Court of Appeals Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo No. 07-25-00229-CV RICHARD A. DUNSMORE, APPELLANT V. MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING CORPORATION, ET AL., APPELLEE On Appeal from the 154th District Court Lamb County, Texas Trial Court No. DCV-20965-24, Honorable Scott A. Say, Presiding March 30, 2026 MEMORANDUM OPINION Before PARKER, C.J., and DOSS and YARBROUGH, JJ. Appellant, Richard A. Dunsmore, appeals from the trial court's Order of Dismissal.

We dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution. Appellant's brief was originally due December 29, 2025, but was not filed. By letter of January 7, 2026, we notified Appellant that the appeal was

subject to dismissal for want of prosecution, without further notice, if a brief was not received by January 20, 2026.

On January 21, 2026, Appellant attempted to file a brief electronically. Because the brief was not accompanied by a motion for extension, the Clerk of this Court rejected the filing and instructed Appellant to refile the brief with a motion for extension within three days. No motion or brief was received. By letter of February 6, 2026, we again directed Appellant to file a brief with a motion for extension by February 17, 2026, admonishing that failure to do so would result in dismissal for want of prosecution.

To date, Appellant has neither complied with this directive nor had any further communication with this Court. Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal for want of prosecution. See TEX. R. APP. P. 38.8(a)(1), 42.3(b). Per Curiam 2