

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, FOURTH DISTRICT, SAN ANTONIO

In re Commitment of Jose Arredondo, Jr.

No. 04-25-00235-CV · No. No. 04-25-00235-CV · Decided April 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Fourth Court of Appeals affirmed the civil commitment of Jose Arredondo, Jr. as a sexually violent predator. The court held that the trial court did not abuse its discretion by refusing to instruct the jury that expert testimony should be considered like any other testimony, because the proposed instruction would have effectively singled out the State’s expert and commented on the weight of the evidence. The court relied on Davidson v. Wallingford and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 226a and 277.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Texas Court of Appeals, Fourth District, San Antonio
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Rebeca C. Martinez, Chief Justice; Irene Rios, Justice; Lori I. Valenzuela, Justice
JURISDICTION	Texas Court of Appeals, Fourth District, San Antonio
DECIDED	April 8, 2026
DOCKET	No. 04-25-00235-CV
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Arredondo appealed the trial court's order adjudging him a sexually violent predator and civilly committing him after a jury found beyond a reasonable doubt that he met the statutory definition. He challenged the refusal to submit his requested jury instruction concerning expert testimony.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A trial court's decision to submit or refuse a particular jury instruction is reviewed for abuse of discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Jose Arredondo, Jr.

TOPICS

- jury instructions
- expert testimony
- instructions objections
- standard of review
- health law

PRACTICE AREAS

civil commitment

sexually violent predator proceedings

evidence

jury instructions

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by refusing to instruct the jury that expert testimony should be considered like any other testimony.

HOLDINGS

1. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by refusing the requested expert-testimony instruction because, given that Turner was the only expert and one of only two witnesses, the instruction would have effectively singled out Turner's testimony and commented on the weight of the evidence.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The court should simply have charged that the jury were the judges of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight of the evidence." (1033)

"You are to make up your own minds about the facts. You are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight to give their testimony but on matters of law, you must follow all of my instructions." (-3-)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case concerned civil commitment proceedings under the Texas Sexually Violent Predator Act. The only trial witnesses were Arredondo and Darrel Turner, Ph.D., a psychologist retained by the State to perform an abnormal behavioral evaluation. Arredondo requested an instruction stating that the jury should consider expert testimony like any other testimony and could accept or reject it, but the trial court refused the request.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury found beyond a reasonable doubt that Arredondo was a sexually violent predator. The 451st Judicial District Court of Kendall County adjudged him a sexually violent predator and civilly committed him for sex-offender treatment and supervision. Arredondo timely appealed, and the Fourth Court of Appeals affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Davidson v. Wallingford, 32 S.W. 1030, 1033 (Tex. 1895)
- Thota v. Young, 366 S.W.3d 678, 687 (Tex. 2012)