

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

Brandon Williams v. Megan Nabila Mitchell

No. 03-26-00012-CV (Tex. App.—Austin Feb. 19, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. 03-26-00012-CV · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals, Third District, dismissed Brandon Williams’s attempted appeal for want of jurisdiction because his notice of appeal from the August 2024 protective-order judgment was filed in January 2026. The court held that the protective order was the final judgment and that Williams missed both the applicable notice-of-appeal deadline and the window for seeking an extension.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Texas Court of Appeals, Third District, at Austin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chari L. Kelly; Justices Triana, Kelly, and Ellis
JURISDICTION	Texas Court of Appeals, Third District, at Austin
DECIDED	February 19, 2026
DOCKET	03-26-00012-CV
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a family-violence protective order and final judgment; the court dismissed the attempted appeal for want of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was untimely.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of appellate jurisdiction and compliance with jurisdictional deadlines.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Brandon Williams v. Megan Nabila Mitchell

TOPICS

- appellate jurisdiction
- final judgment rule
- appellate procedure
- family law procedure
- domestic violence

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- family law
- protective orders

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the August 16, 2024 protective order was the final judgment from which the appellate deadline began to run.
2. Whether Williams's January 7, 2026 notice of appeal and January 6, 2026 extension motion were timely enough to invoke the court's appellate jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. Because the protective order disposed of the only claim in the suit, the protective order signed on August 16, 2024 was the final judgment.
2. A timely notice of appeal is a jurisdictional requirement, and Williams's notice filed well after the applicable deadline did not invoke the court's jurisdiction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This attempted appeal must be dismissed for want of jurisdiction.”

“A timely notice of appeal is a jurisdictional requirement for an appeal”

“We dismiss this attempted appeal for want of jurisdiction.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mitchell's underlying suit sought a family-violence protective order against Williams. The associate judge signed the requested protective order on August 16, 2024, and the presiding district-court judge signed it later that day. Williams did not file his notice of appeal until January 7, 2026.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Megan Nabila Mitchell sought a family-violence protective order against Brandon Williams in the 455th District Court of Travis County. An associate judge and, later the same day, the presiding district-court judge signed the protective order on August 16, 2024. Williams filed his notice of appeal on January 7, 2026 and sought an extension on January 6, 2026. After notifying Williams of the jurisdictional problem and receiving no response, the court dismissed the appeal.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- B.C. v. Rhodes, 116 S.W.3d 878, 881–82 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.)
- Baker v. Bizzle, 687 S.W.3d 285, 291–92 (Tex. 2024)
- Connally v. Mannas, No. 03-24-00167-CV, 2024 WL 3954529, at *1 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 28, 2024, no pet.) (mem. op.)
- Houser v. McElveen, 243 S.W.3d 646, 646 (Tex. 2008) (per curiam)

OPINION

Brandon Williams v. Megan Nabila Mitchell

PER CURIAM.

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-26-00012-CV

Brandon Williams, Appellant v. Megan Nabila Mitchell, Appellee

FROM THE 455TH DISTRICT COURT OF TRAVIS COUNTY

NO. D-1-FM-24-005735, THE HONORABLE CATHERINE A. MAUZY, JUDGE PRESIDING

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Brandon Williams' notice of appeal was filed in 2026, and by it he seeks to appeal an August 2024 final judgment. This attempted appeal must be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Megan Mitchell initiated the underlying suit, seeking ultimately simply a family-violence protective order against Williams. On August 16, 2024, an associate judge signed the requested protective order, and later that same day, the presiding district-court judge signed the protective order. Because the protective order disposed of the only claim in the suit— Mitchell's request for the protective order—the signed protective order was the final judgment in the suit. See *B.C. v. Rhodes*, 116 S.W.3d 878, 881–82 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.); see also *Baker v. Bizzle*, 687 S.W.3d 285, 291–92 (Tex. 2024) (presiding judge's act of signing judgment constitutes rendition of judgment). A timely notice of appeal is a jurisdictional requirement for an appeal, and the period during which parties must file their notice of appeal begins with the signing of the judgment to be appealed. See Tex. R. App. P. 25.1, 26.1; *Connally v. Mannas*, No. 03-24-00167-CV, 2024 WL 3954529, at *1 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 28, 2024, no pet.) (mem. op.). Even assuming that Williams had the extended 90-day deadline from August 16, 2024, to file his notice of appeal under Rule 26.1(a), he did not file a notice of appeal until January 7, 2026, and did not move for an extension to file his notice of appeal until January 6, 2026, well beyond the 15-day window during which we could have entertained an extension motion. See Tex. R. App. P. 26.3; *Houser v. McElveen*, 243 S.W.3d 646, 646 (Tex. 2008) (per curiam). Our Clerk sent a letter to Williams identifying the jurisdictional problem and asking him to respond with how our Court may exercise jurisdiction over this attempted appeal. More than 10 days have elapsed since the letter without a response from Williams. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a). We dismiss this attempted appeal for want of jurisdiction.

_____ Chari L. Kelly, Justice Before Justices Triana, Kelly, and Ellis Dismissed for Want of Jurisdiction Filed: February 19, 2026 2