

COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT AT
TEXARKANA

In re Christy Lynne Powell

No. 06-26-00033-CV · No. 06-26-00033-CV · Decided March 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The Sixth Court of Appeals of Texas denied Christy Lynne Powell’s petition for a writ of mandamus seeking relief from trial court sanctions orders. The court held that Powell failed to comply with Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 52.7(a)(1) because her appendix omitted the motions for sanctions, and it denied her emergency motion to stay enforcement as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Texas, Sixth Appellate District at Texarkana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Justice Charles van Cleef; Chief Justice Stevens; Justice van Cleef; Justice Rambin
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Texas, Sixth Appellate District at Texarkana
DECIDED	March 24, 2026
DOCKET	06-26-00033-CV
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original mandamus proceeding challenging trial court orders imposing sanctions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandamus relief requires the relator to establish both a clear abuse of discretion and the absence of a clear and adequate remedy at law. The relator bears the burden of providing a sufficient mandamus record.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Christy Lynne Powell v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- standard of review
- sanctions
- remedies
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- sanctions
- mandamus
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Powell was entitled to mandamus relief from the trial court's sanctions orders when her mandamus appendix omitted the motions for sanctions underlying those orders.
2. Whether Powell's emergency motion to stay enforcement of the sanctions orders should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. A relator is not entitled to mandamus relief when the mandamus record fails to include certified or sworn copies of every material document filed in the underlying proceeding, including the motion upon which the challenged order is based.
2. The emergency motion to stay enforcement of the sanctions orders is moot after the court denied the petition for writ of mandamus.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Mandamus issues only when the mandamus record establishes (1) a clear abuse of discretion . . . , and (2) the absence of a clear and adequate remedy at law.” (Opinion at 1)

“It is the relator’s burden to provide this Court with a sufficient record to establish his or her right to mandamus relief.” (Opinion at 1)

“Because Powell did not comply with Rule 52.7(a)(1), we deny her petition for a writ of mandamus.” (Opinion at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Powell sought mandamus relief from trial court orders imposing sanctions against her. Her appendix included the sanctions orders and her pro se responses, but omitted the real party in interest's motions for sanctions, which were material documents considered by the trial court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Christy Lynne Powell petitioned the Court of Appeals for a writ of mandamus seeking relief from sanctions orders entered by the trial court. The court denied the petition because Powell failed to provide the complete record required by Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 52.7(a)(1), including the motions for sanctions underlying the challenged orders. The court also denied Powell's emergency motion to stay enforcement as moot.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- In re Blakeney, 254 S.W.3d 659, 661 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 2008, orig. proceeding)
- Cantu v. Longoria, 878 S.W.2d 131 (Tex. 1994) (per curiam) (orig. proceeding)
- Walker v. Packer, 827 S.W.2d 833, 839-40 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding)

- In re John Gannon, Inc., No. 14-21-00005-CV, 2021 WL 1307248, at *1 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Apr. 8, 2021, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.)
- In re Fields, No. 14-17-00640-CV, 2017 WL 3495396, at *1 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Aug. 15, 2017, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.)
- In re Sampson, No. 06-25-00141-CR, 2025 WL 2811337, at *1 (Tex. App.—Texarkana Oct. 3, 2025, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.)
- In re Lynch, No. 06-25-00029-CV, 2025 WL 1131395, at *1 (Tex. App.—Texarkana Apr. 17, 2025, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.)