

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.)