

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT FORT WORTH

In the Interest of N.G., a Child v. the State of Texas

No. 02-25-00668-CV · No. No. 02-25-00668-CV · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals for the Second District dismissed L.G.'s appeal from an order enforcing and modifying a child-support obligation. The court held that the notice of appeal, filed more than nine years after the order and beyond the applicable deadline, was untimely and deprived the court of jurisdiction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Second District of Texas at Fort Worth
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dana Womack; Wallach; Walker
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Second District of Texas at Fort Worth
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	No. 02-25-00668-CV
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from the 325th District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, challenging the trial court's Order Enforcing and Modifying Support Obligation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the jurisdictional requirement that a notice of appeal be timely filed; an appellate court must dismiss for want of jurisdiction when the notice is untimely and no timely extension request was filed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	L.G. v. the State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate jurisdiction
- final judgment rule
- appellate procedure
- family law procedure
- child support

PRACTICE AREAS

- family law
- civil procedure
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court of appeals had jurisdiction when L.G.'s notice of appeal was filed after the applicable deadline.
2. Whether L.G.'s response to the court's jurisdictional warning established grounds to continue the appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. Because L.G. filed his notice of appeal after the jurisdictional deadline and did not file a timely extension request, the court lacked jurisdiction over the appeal.
2. The appeal must be dismissed for want of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was untimely.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The time for filing a notice of appeal is jurisdictional in this court, and without a timely filed notice of appeal or a timely filed extension request, we must dismiss the appeal.”

“Because L.G.’s notice of appeal was untimely, we dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

L.G. sought to appeal an order enforcing and modifying a support obligation that the trial court signed on August 18, 2016. Although he timely filed a motion for new trial, he waited until December 3, 2025, to file his notice of appeal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The trial court signed the challenged order on August 18, 2016. L.G. timely filed a motion for new trial, making the notice of appeal due November 16, 2016, but he did not file his notice of appeal until December 3, 2025. After notifying the parties that the appeal appeared untimely and requesting grounds for continuing it, the court received a response from L.G. but found no basis to continue the appeal.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Jones v. City of Houston, 976 S.W.2d 676, 677 (Tex. 1998)
- Verburgt v. Dorner, 959 S.W.2d 615, 617 (Tex. 1997)
- Amick v. Campbell, No. 02-24-00540-CV, 2025 WL 285339, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Jan. 23, 2025, no pet.) (mem. op.)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In the Court of Appeals Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth
_____ No. 02-25-00668-CV _____ IN THE
INTEREST OF N.G., A CHILD On Appeal from the 325th District Court Tarrant County, Texas
Trial Court No. 325-505917-11 Before Womack, Wallach, and Walker, JJ. Memorandum Opinion
by Justice Womack MEMORANDUM OPINION Appellant L.G. attempts to appeal from the trial
court’s “Order Enforcing and Modifying Support Obligation” signed on August 18, 2016 (the
Order).

Because L.G. timely filed a motion for new trial, his notice of appeal was due November 16, 2016
— ninety days after the Order’s signing. See Tex. R. App. P. 26.1(a)(1). But L.G. did not file his
notice of appeal until December 3, 2025, making it untimely. See *id.* We notified the parties by
letter of our concern that we lack jurisdiction over this appeal because the notice of appeal was
untimely.

See *id.* We warned that we could dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction unless L.G. or any
party wanting to continue the appeal filed a response showing grounds for continuing it. See Tex.
R. App. P. 42.3(a), 44.3.

Although we received a response from L.G., it does not show grounds for continuing the appeal.
The time for filing a notice of appeal is jurisdictional in this court, and without a timely filed
notice of appeal or a timely filed extension request, we must dismiss the appeal. See Tex. R. App.
P. 2, 25.1(b), 26.1, 26.3; *Jones v. City of Houston*, 976 S.W.2d 676, 677 (Tex.

1998); *Verburgt v. Dorner*, 959 S.W.2d 615, 617 (Tex. 1997). Because L.G.’s notice of appeal was
untimely, we dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 43.2(f);
Amick v. Campbell, No. 02-24-00540-CV, 2025 WL 285339, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Jan.
23, 2025, no pet.) (mem. op.) (“Because Amick’s notice of appeal was untimely, we dismiss this
appeal for want of jurisdiction.”).

2 /s/ Dana Womack Dana Womack Justice Delivered: January 8, 2026 3