

**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.

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