

COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, THIRTEENTH DISTRICT, CORPUS
CHRISTI–EDINBURG

In re Christopher Vickers

In re Vickers · No. 13-26-00146-CV, 13-26-00147-CV, 13-26-00148-CV · Decided March 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The Thirteenth Court of Appeals of Texas denied Christopher Vickers’s petitions for writ of mandamus in three related appellate causes. The court concluded that Vickers had not met his burden to establish entitlement to mandamus relief concerning modifications to conservatorship, possession and access, and the designation of the children’s primary residence, and it lifted the previously imposed stay.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Texas, Thirteenth District, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
WRITING FOR THE COURT	L. Aron Peña Jr.; Chief Justice Tijerina; Justice Peña; Justice West
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Texas, Thirteenth District, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
DECIDED	March 13, 2026
DOCKET	13-26-00146-CV, 13-26-00147-CV, 13-26-00148-CV
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Christopher Vickers petitioned for a writ of mandamus challenging trial-court orders modifying conservatorship, possession and access, and the conservator with the right to designate the primary residence of minor children. The court denied mandamus relief in all three appellate causes.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandamus is an extraordinary and discretionary remedy. The relator must show that the trial court abused its discretion and that the relator lacks an adequate remedy on appeal. The relator bears the burden of proving both requirements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Christopher Vickers, relator v. Lena Cherie Chaisson-Munoz, real party in interest

TOPICS

family law procedure

child custody

appellate procedure

remedies

standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

family law

appellate procedure

mandamus

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by modifying conservatorship and possession and access without proper notice.
2. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by modifying the conservator with the right to designate the primary residence of the minor children.
3. Whether Vickers established both an abuse of discretion and the absence of an adequate remedy by appeal sufficient to warrant mandamus relief.

HOLDINGS

1. A relator seeking mandamus relief must establish that the trial court abused its discretion and that the relator lacks an adequate remedy on appeal; the relator bears the burden of proving both requirements.
2. Vickers was not entitled to mandamus relief because he did not meet his burden under the applicable mandamus standard.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Mandamus is an extraordinary and discretionary remedy.”

“The relator must show that (1) the trial court abused its discretion, and (2) the relator lacks an adequate remedy on appeal.”

“The relator bears the burden of proving these two requirements.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Vickers challenged trial-court orders concerning conservatorship, possession and access, and designation of the primary residence of minor children. He asserted that the orders were entered without proper notice and improperly modified the conservator with the right to designate the children's primary residence. The appellate court considered the petitions, the record, applicable law, and the response of Lena Cherie Chaisson-Munoz, but concluded that Vickers had not met the requirements for mandamus relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The petition arose from proceedings in trial-court cause numbers 2023-DCL-01268, 2025-DCL-6853, and 2026-DCL-59 in the 444th District Court of Cameron County, Texas. The court of appeals consolidated its consideration of the three mandamus proceedings into a single memorandum opinion, granted the real party in interest's motions for leave to file responses, lifted the previously imposed stay, and denied each petition.

DISPOSITION

CASES CITED

- In re Allstate Indem. Co., 622 S.W.3d 870, 883 (Tex. 2021) (orig. proceeding)
- In re Garza, 544 S.W.3d 836, 840 (Tex. 2018) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam)
- In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am., 148 S.W.3d 124, 135–36, 138 (Tex. 2004) (orig. proceeding)
- In re USAA Gen. Indem. Co., 624 S.W.3d 782, 787 (Tex. 2021) (orig. proceeding)
- Walker v. Packer, 827 S.W.2d 833, 839–40 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding)
- In re H.E.B. Grocery Co., 492 S.W.3d 300, 302 (Tex. 2016) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

NUMBERS 13-26-00146-CV, 13-26-00147-CV, 13-26-00148-CV COURT OF APPEALS THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG IN RE CHRISTOPHER VICKERS ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS MEMORANDUM OPINION Before Chief Justice Tijerina and Justices Peña and West Memorandum Opinion by Justice Peña¹ Relator Christopher Vickers filed a petition for writ of mandamus asserting that the trial court abused its discretion by: (1) modifying conservatorship and possession and access without proper notice; and (2) modifying the conservator with the right to designate the primary residence of minor children.

The petition for writ of mandamus arises from 1 See TEX. R. APP. P. 52.8(d) (“When denying relief, the court may hand down an opinion but is not required to do so. When granting relief, the court must hand down an opinion as in any other case.”); *id.* R. 47.4 (distinguishing opinions and memorandum opinions). trial court cause numbers 2023-DCL-01268, 2025-DCL-6853, and 2026-DCL-59 in the 444th District Court of Cameron, County, Texas, docketed respectively in our appellate cause numbers 13-26-00146-CV, 13-26-00147-CV, and 13-26-00148-CV.

We address each of these causes in this single memorandum opinion in the interests of judicial efficiency and economy. Mandamus is an extraordinary and discretionary remedy. See *In re Allstate Indem. Co.*, 622 S.W.3d 870, 883 (Tex. 2021) (orig. proceeding); *In re Garza*, 544 S.W.3d 836, 840 (Tex. 2018) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam); *In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, 148 S.W.3d 124, 138 (Tex.

2004) (orig. proceeding). The relator must show that (1) the trial court abused its discretion, and (2) the relator lacks an adequate remedy on appeal. *In re USAA Gen. Indem. Co.*, 624 S.W.3d 782, 787 (Tex. 2021) (orig. proceeding); *In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, 148 S.W.3d at 135–36;

Walker v. Packer, 827 S.W.2d 833, 839–40 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding). “The relator bears the burden of proving these two requirements.” In re H.E.B.

Grocery Co., 492 S.W.3d 300, 302 (Tex. 2016) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam); Walker, 827 S.W.2d at 840. The Court, having examined and fully considered the petition for writ of mandamus, the record, the applicable law, and the response filed by real party in interest Lena Cherie Chaisson-Munoz, 2 is of the opinion that relator has not met his burden to obtain relief.

Accordingly, we lift the stay previously imposed in these matters. See TEX. R. APP. P. 2 Lena has filed a motion for leave to file her response in each of these cause numbers and a motion for leave to file an amended response in 13-26-00147-CV and 13-26-00148-CV.

We grant her motions, and we consider her response in each of these cause numbers on the merits. 2 52.10(b). We deny the petition for writ of mandamus in each of these cause numbers. L. ARON PEÑA JR. Justice Delivered and filed on the 13th day of March, 2026. 3