

FOURTH COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, SAN ANTONIO

Alexus Najera v. CSC South Hill Realty, LLC

No. 04-25-00499-CV · No. 04-25-00499-CV · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The Fourth Court of Appeals of San Antonio dismissed Alexis Najera’s appeal for want of prosecution. The court found that Najera failed to file an appellate brief and a required response despite notice and an order directing her to do so.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Fourth Court of Appeals of Texas, San Antonio
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Adrian A. Spears II, Justice; H. Todd McCray, Justice; Velia J. Meza, Justice
JURISDICTION	Fourth Court of Appeals of Texas, San Antonio
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	04-25-00499-CV
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appellant appealed from proceedings in the County Court at Law No. 10 of Bexar County. The court of appeals dismissed the appeal after appellant failed to file her appellate brief and a court-ordered written response.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Alexus Najera v. CSC South Hill Realty, LLC

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the appeal should be dismissed for want of prosecution when the appellant failed to timely file an appellate brief and failed to comply with an order directing her to file the brief and a written

response.

HOLDINGS

1. An appellate court may dismiss an appeal for want of prosecution when the appellant fails to timely file an appellate brief and fails to comply with a court order requiring the brief and a written response.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We, therefore, dismiss this appeal for want of prosecution.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The appeal involved appellant Alexis Najera's failure to meet the deadline for filing her appellate brief. After the brief became overdue, the court of appeals gave her an additional court-ordered deadline and required a written response. She failed to file either document by the extended deadline.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Appellant's brief was due November 3, 2025, but she filed neither the brief nor a motion for extension. On November 12, 2025, the court ordered appellant to file the overdue brief and a written response by December 1, 2025, warning that failure to do so would result in dismissal. Appellant failed to comply, and the court dismissed the appeal for want of prosecution.

DISPOSITION

dismissed