

COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, EIGHTH DISTRICT, EL PASO

In re Joshua Christopher Ryan

No. 08-26-00239-CV (Tex. App.—El Paso June 9, 2026) · No. No. 08-26-00239-CV · Decided June 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The Eighth District Court of Appeals of Texas denied Joshua Christopher Ryan’s petition for writ of mandamus seeking to halt trial-court proceedings, vacate orders and actions, sustain a plea to the jurisdiction, and dismiss related cases. The court also struck the petition because it disclosed prohibited sensitive data identifying a minor and dismissed pending motions as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Texas, Eighth District, El Paso
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maria Salas Mendoza, Chief Justice; Palafox, Justice; Soto, Justice
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Texas, Eighth District, El Paso
DECIDED	June 9, 2026
DOCKET	No. 08-26-00239-CV
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original proceeding on a petition for writ of mandamus.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandamus relief was denied because Ryan did not establish that he was entitled to the requested relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Joshua Christopher Ryan, Relator v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- remedies
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- appellate procedure
- mandamus
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Ryan established entitlement to writ-of-mandamus relief concerning the underlying trial-court proceedings and orders.

2. Whether the petition had to be struck for violating Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.9(a)(3) by including prohibited sensitive information identifying a minor.

HOLDINGS

1. Ryan did not establish that he was entitled to the requested mandamus relief, so the court denied the petition.
2. A petition containing the name of a child who was a minor when the underlying suit was filed violates Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.9(a)(3) and may be struck.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ryan filed a petition for writ of mandamus seeking broad relief concerning proceedings in an underlying trial-court action, including vacatur of a transfer order and dismissal for lack of jurisdiction. His petition also disclosed the name of a child who was a minor when the underlying suit was filed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ryan sought mandamus relief to halt proceedings in the trial court, vacate an order transferring the underlying case to the 65th District Court, vacate actions allegedly taken after a prior judge's recusal, sustain his plea to the jurisdiction, dismiss the underlying action with prejudice, and dismiss related cases. The court denied mandamus relief, dismissed pending motions as moot, and struck the petition because it included prohibited sensitive information identifying a minor.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- In re R.B., No. 05-21-01063-CV, 2022 WL 202986, at *1 (Tex. App.—Dallas Jan. 24, 2022, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.)
- In re Read, No. 05-23-00028-CV, 2023 WL 355145, at *1 (Tex. App.—Dallas Jan. 23, 2023, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

COURT OF APPEALS EIGHTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS EL PASO, TEXAS No. 08-26-00239-CV In re Joshua Christopher Ryan AN ORIGINAL PROCEEDING IN MANDAMUS M E M O R A N D U M O P I N I O N Relator, Joshua Christopher Ryan, has filed a petition for writ of mandamus, requesting that we stop all proceedings in the trial court; direct the Honorable Selina Saenz to vacate an order transferring the underlying case to the 65th District Court; vacate all actions taken after the alleged recusal of a previous judge; sustain Ryan's plea to the jurisdiction,

and “dismiss the underlying action with prejudice for an absolute want of jurisdiction”; and dismiss “all related cases.” After consideration, the Court has determined that Ryan has not established that he is entitled to the relief sought.

We deny the petition. We dismiss any pending motions as moot. In addition, Ryan included prohibited sensitive data—the name of a child who was a minor when the underlying suit was filed—in his petition. See Tex. R. App. P. 9.9(a)(3).

We strike the petition. See *In re R.B.*, No. 05-21-01063-CV, 2022 WL 202986, at *1 (Tex. App.—Dallas Jan. 24, 2022, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.) (“We also strike the petition and supporting appendix for relator’s failure to comply with Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.9’s redaction requirements.”); *In re Read*, No. 05-23-00028-CV, 2023 WL 355145, at *1 (Tex.

App.—Dallas Jan. 23, 2023, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.) (denying mandamus relief and then striking petition for failure to comply with Rule 9.9 by including a minor’s full name in the petition). MARIA SALAS MENDOZA, Chief Justice June 9, 2026 Before Salas Mendoza, C.J., Palafox, and Soto, JJ. 2