

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AUSTIN

Demetrius T. Crockett v. Keystone Automotive Industries, Inc.

No. 03-26-00202-CV · No. 03-26-00202-CV · Decided April 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals, Third District, dismissed Demetrius T. Crockett’s pro se appeal for want of jurisdiction. The court held that Crockett, having been declared a vexatious litigant, failed to obtain the required permission from the local administrative judge before filing the appeal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Texas Court of Appeals, Third District, Austin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karin Crump; Chief Justice Byrne; Justice Theofanis; Justice Crump
JURISDICTION	Texas Court of Appeals, Third District, Austin
DECIDED	April 3, 2026
DOCKET	03-26-00202-CV
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se appeal dismissed for want of jurisdiction because the appellant, having been declared a vexatious litigant and subject to a prefiling order, did not obtain permission from the appropriate local administrative judge before filing the appeal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Demetrius T. Crockett v. Keystone Automotive Industries, Inc.

TOPICS

[appellate jurisdiction](#) [appellate procedure](#) [civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#) [appellate procedure](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a pro se appeal filed by a vexatious litigant subject to a Texas prefiling order may proceed without permission from the appropriate local administrative judge.

2. Whether the appeal should be dismissed for want of jurisdiction when the required prefiling permission was not obtained.

HOLDINGS

1. A clerk may not file a pro se appeal or other claim presented by a vexatious litigant subject to a Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code section 11.101 prefiling order unless the litigant first obtains an order from the appropriate local administrative judge permitting the filing.
2. An appeal filed without the required vexatious-litigant prefiling permission must be dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because a prerequisite to filing Crockett’s appeal was not met, this appeal should not have been filed.” (2)

“Accordingly, we lift the stay and dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Crockett had previously been declared a vexatious litigant and was subject to a Texas prefiling order prohibiting him from filing new litigation pro se without permission from the appropriate local administrative judge. He filed this appeal pro se but did not obtain or demonstrate that he had obtained the required permission.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Crockett appealed from the County Court at Law No. 2 of Travis County. The court of appeals stayed the appeal and gave Crockett an opportunity to demonstrate that he had obtained the required local administrative judge's permission to file because he was subject to a vexatious-litigant prefiling order. Crockett filed no response, so the court lifted the stay and dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Madugula v. FM 969 Com. Dev., LLC, No. 03-24-00565-CV, 2024 WL 4362839 (Tex. App.—Austin Oct. 2, 2024, no pet.) (mem. op.)

OPINION

Demetrius T. Crockett v. Keystone Automotive Industries, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-26-00202-CV

Demetrius T. Crockett, Appellant v. Keystone Automotive Industries, Inc., Appellee

FROM THE COUNTY COURT AT LAW NO. 2 OF TRAVIS COUNTY

NO. C-1-CV-24-004988, THE HONORABLE ERIC SHEPPERD, JUDGE PRESIDING
MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant Demetrius T. Crockett, acting pro se, filed an appeal that we stayed on January 26, 2026, allowing him an opportunity to obtain the local administrative judge's permission to file this appeal because, in a separate cause, Crockett has been declared a vexatious litigant. See Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 11.054 (stating criteria for finding plaintiff vexatious litigant). Our stay order advised Crockett that failure to obtain the local administrative judge's permission would result in dismissal of this appeal for want of jurisdiction. See *Madugula v. FM 969 Com. Dev., LLC*, No. 03-24-00565-CV, 2024 WL 4362839, at *1 (Tex. App.—Austin Oct. 2, 2024, no pet.) (mem. op.) (following similar procedure). The Travis County district court's order declaring Crockett a vexatious litigant prohibits him from filing as a pro se party "any new litigation in a court in Texas against any party," unless he first obtains "permission from the appropriate local administrative judge as required by Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code section 11.102(a)." See Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §§ 11.101(a) (authorizing court to enter order prohibiting person from filing new litigation in court to which order applies without permission from appropriate local administrative judge if court finds person is vexatious litigant), .102 (addressing permission by local administrative judge); see also *Madugula*, 2024 WL 4362839, at *1 (noting that prefiling order entered by district court applies to each court in this state). When a vexatious litigant is subject to a prefiling order under Section 11.101, a clerk of a court may not file a litigation, original proceeding, appeal, or other claim presented, pro se, by a vexatious litigant unless the litigant obtains an order from the appropriate local administrative judge permitting the filing. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 11.103(a); *Madugula*, 2024 WL 4362839, at *1; see Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 11.1035 (providing procedure for dismissal of litigation mistakenly filed without requisite order from local administrative judge). Crockett filed no response to our request that he demonstrate permission from the local administrative judge to file this appeal. See Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 11.103(a). Because a prerequisite to filing Crockett's appeal was not met, this appeal should not have been filed. See *id.*; *Madugula*, 2024 WL 4362839, at *2 (dismissing appeal for want of jurisdiction because appellant who had been declared vexatious litigant had not requested permission from local administrative judge). Accordingly, we lift the stay and dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a).

Karin Crump, Justice 2 Before Chief Justice Byrne,
Justices Theofanis and Crump Dismissed for Want of Jurisdiction Filed: April 3, 2026 3