

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST DISTRICT OF TEXAS

In re Angela Bass

No. 01-26-00198-CV · No. 01-26-00198-CV · Decided March 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The First Court of Appeals of Texas dismissed Angela Bass’s petition for writ of mandamus as moot. The trial court had already vacated the challenged writ of sequestration, granting the relief sought, and the court also dismissed pending motions as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Chief Justice Adams; Justice Gunn; Justice Johnson
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas
DECIDED	March 5, 2026
DOCKET	01-26-00198-CV
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original proceeding on a petition for writ of mandamus seeking to compel the trial court to vacate an order granting a writ of sequestration.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Angela Bass, Relator

TOPICS

mootness writ of certiorari appellate procedure remedies civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure Appellate procedure Mandamus Remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the petition for writ of mandamus became moot after the trial court vacated the challenged order.
- Whether the court could compel the trial court to vacate an order that it had already vacated.

HOLDINGS

1. A mandamus petition is moot when the trial court has already vacated the challenged order and the relator has received the relief sought.
2. A court cannot compel a trial court to vacate an order that the trial court has already vacated.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We dismiss the mandamus petition as moot because Relator has received the relief sought in her petition, and we cannot compel the trial court to vacate an order it has already vacated.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The underlying case involved an October 20, 2025 trial-court order granting a writ of sequestration. Although Angela Bass sought mandamus relief requiring that order to be vacated, the trial court had already voided it on December 29, 2025.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The trial court granted a writ of sequestration on October 20, 2025. Before the mandamus petition was filed, the trial court vacated that order on December 29, 2025. Angela Bass then filed a mandamus petition seeking the same relief, and the court of appeals dismissed the petition as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- In re Bridger Ins. Servs., No. 01-25-00249-CV, 2025 WL 1460732, at *1 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] May 22, 2025, orig. proceeding)
- In re Navarro, No. 14-24-00064-CV, 2024 WL 1514591, at *1 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Apr. 9, 2024, orig. proceeding)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Opinion issued March 5, 2026 In The Court of Appeals For The First District of Texas NO. 01-26-00198-CV IN RE ANGELA BASS, Relator Original Proceeding on Petition for Writ of Mandamus MEMORANDUM OPINION On February 27, 2026, Relator Angela Bass filed a petition for writ of mandamus asking this Court to compel the trial court to vacate its October 20, 2025 order granting a writ of sequestration.¹ Relator acknowledges that the trial court ¹ The underlying case is Mercedes-Benz Financial Services USA LLC v. Angela Petrice Bass, cause number 2025-66164, pending in the 165th District Court of Harris County, Texas, the Honorable

Bruce Bain presiding. voided the challenged order on December 29, 2025, but argues she is entitled to the same relief by mandamus.

We dismiss the mandamus petition as moot because Relator has received the relief sought in her petition, and we cannot compel the trial court to vacate an order it has already vacated. See *In re Bridger Ins. Servs.*, No. 01-25-00249-CV, 2025 WL 1460732, at *1 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] May 22, 2025, orig. proceeding) (dismissing mandamus petition as moot because trial court vacated challenged order and relator “received the relief sought” in its petition); *In re Navarro*, No. 14-24-00064-CV, 2024 WL 1514591, at *1 (Tex.

App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Apr. 9, 2024, orig. proceeding) (same). We further dismiss any pending motions as moot. PER CURIAM Panel consists of Chief Justice Adams and Justices Gunn and Johnson. 2