

**COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS,
CORPUS CHRISTI–EDINBURG**

**Erika Santiagos and Osbaldo A. Saenz Jr. v. Selvin Santiagos-
Salguero**

No. 13-25-00617-CV (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg Jan. 29, 2026) · No. 13-25-00617-CV · Decided
January 29, 2026

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

NUMBER 13-25-00617-CV COURT OF APPEALS THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

AND OSBALDO A. SAENZ JR., Appellants, v. SELVIN SANTIAGOS-SALGUERO, Appellee.

ON APPEAL FROM
THE 332ND DISTRICT COURT OF HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

MEMORANDUM

OPINION Before Justices Silva, Cron, and Fonseca Memorandum Opinion by Justice Silva This matter is before the Court on appellants’ “amended motion extending time to file appellants cure of defect” which also contains a motion for access to the record.

Upon review of appellants’ notice of appeal and all other documents before us, we are of the opinion that this court lacks jurisdiction and the case should be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. On November 14, 2025, appellants attempted to appeal the trial court’s “Order of Transfer” entered on October 29, 2025 in trial court cause number C-4359-25-F.

On November 24, 2025, the Clerk of the Court notified appellants that it appears the order they were attempting to appeal was unappealable. On December 17, 2025, the Clerk of the Court again notified appellants that it appears that the order they were attempting to appeal was not an appealable order. Appellants were further notified that if the defect was not cured within ten days from the date of the notice, the appeal would be dismissed.

On January 14, 2026, appellants requested fifteen to thirty additional days to cure the defect and requested access to the appellate record. However, appellants failed to provide adequate explanation for the delay or why the record is necessary to establish jurisdiction. Upon review of the documents before us, we are of the opinion that an order transferring a case between district courts is not a final appealable order. “[A]n order or judgment is not final for purposes of appeal unless it actually disposes of every pending claim and party or unless it clearly and unequivocally

states that it finally disposes of all claims and parties.” *Lehmann v. Har-Con Corp.*, 39 S.W.3d 191, 205 (Tex.

2001). Absent an appealable interlocutory order or final judgment, this Court has no jurisdiction over this appeal. See *Ogletree v. Matthews*, 262 W.S.3d 316, 319 n.1 (Tex. 2007); *Lehmann*, 39 S.W.3d at 195. We are of the opinion that an order transferring a case between district courts is unappealable, and appellant has failed to establish our jurisdiction over the matter.

The 2 Court, having considered the notice of appeal, documents on file, and appellants’ failure to establish jurisdiction or otherwise correct the defect in their notice of appeal, we deny both motions and dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. See TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a), (c). CLARISSA SILVA Justice Delivered and filed on the 29th day of January, 2026.