

FIFTEENTH COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS

Dominique Reed and Dakota Hill v. Cypress Creek at South Cedar

Reed v. Cypress Creek · No. 15-25-00197-CV · Decided November 21, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is an emergency motion filed by Dominique Reed and Dakota Hill in the Fifteenth Court of Appeals of Texas. The appellants seek reconsideration of the court's November 19, 2025 order, reinstatement of an appellate stay concerning a writ of possession, modification or waiver of supersedeas requirements, and abatement to compel action by the district court. They argue that execution of the writ would cause homelessness, that available funds could satisfy security requirements, and that the underlying eviction judgment is jurisdictionally defective.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Fifteenth Court of Appeals of Texas
DECIDED	November 21, 2025
DOCKET	15-25-00197-CV
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appellants filed an emergency motion for reconsideration of the Fifteenth Court of Appeals' November 19, 2025 order denying temporary relief and lifting a previously issued appellate stay. They also moved to reinstate the appellate stay and alternatively requested temporary relief and abatement.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	none apparent from supplied document
PARTIES	Dominique Reed, Dakota Hill v. Cypress Creek at South Cedar

TOPICS

[motion for reconsideration](#) [appellate procedure](#) [injunctions](#) [eviction](#) [landlord tenant](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[appellate procedure](#) [civil procedure](#) [landlord-tenant law](#) [eviction](#) [remedies](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the appellate court should reconsider its November 19, 2025 order denying temporary relief and lifting the appellate stay.

2. Whether the appellate court should reinstate or temporarily reinstate the stay under Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure 29.3 and 24.4(c).
3. Whether the appellate court should modify or waive supersedeas security because compliance allegedly would cause substantial economic harm.
4. Whether the appellate court should abate the appeal and direct the 146th District Court to rule on appellants' emergency motion for withdrawal of funds.
5. Whether the underlying eviction judgment was allegedly void for failure to issue a required notice to vacate.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Appellants were subject to an eviction judgment and writ of possession and asserted that execution of the writ would cause immediate homelessness for Dominique Reed and her minor child. They claimed to have cured an earlier rent default by paying \$2,414 on August 9, 2025, but alleged that the eviction action filed on August 21, 2025 concerned later months for which no valid thirty-day notice to vacate had been issued. Appellants also asserted that \$10,493.33 was held in a separate Bell County district-court registry and could be used to satisfy supersedeas requirements, but that the district court had not ruled on their requests to withdraw funds.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The appeal arises from an eviction judgment and writ of possession entered in County Court at Law No. 1 of Bell County, trial court cause number 25CCV01420. The motion states that the Third Court of Appeals previously issued a stay, which the Fifteenth Court of Appeals lifted by order dated November 19, 2025. Appellants sought reconsideration and requested that the appellate court reinstate the stay while a separate district court considered motions concerning funds allegedly needed for supersedeas.

DISPOSITION

other