

COURT OF APPEALS, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT FORT WORTH

Kellus Joseph Bravo v. Corraima Bravo

No. 02-25-00184-CV (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Feb. 5, 2026) · No. No. 02-25-00184-CV · Decided February 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District, affirmed a divorce decree appointing Corraima Bravo as sole managing conservator, denying Kellus Joseph Bravo possession and access to the children, and ordering him to pay child support and medical support. The court held that the decree was not a default judgment because Bravo was represented by counsel, and any complaint about inadequate trial notice was waived. Because Bravo did not obtain a reporter’s record, the court presumed sufficient evidence supported the conservatorship and child-support rulings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dana Womack; Sudderth, C.J.; Womack, J.; Wallach, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth
DECIDED	February 5, 2026
DOCKET	No. 02-25-00184-CV
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Husband appealed from a final decree of divorce after the trial court appointed Wife sole managing conservator, denied Husband possession and access to the children, and ordered him to pay child and medical support.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Most appealable issues in family-law cases are reviewed for abuse of discretion. When reviewing whether a trial court abused its discretion by deciding an issue without sufficient evidentiary support, the appellate court asks whether the trial court had sufficient information on which to exercise its discretion and whether it erred in applying that discretion. Without a reporter's record, the appellate court presumes that the trial court heard sufficient evidence to support the judgment and cannot review evidentiary-sufficiency or abuse-of-discretion complaints dependent on the evidence.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Kellus Joseph Bravo v. Corraima Bravo

TOPICS

family law procedure divorce child custody child support appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

family law appellate procedure civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court entered an impermissible post-answer default judgment after Husband allegedly received only four days' notice of the trial setting.
2. Whether the trial court erred by appointing Wife sole managing conservator and denying Husband possession and access without testimony or admitted exhibits.
3. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by ordering child support without evidence of Husband's income, resources, or ability to pay.

HOLDINGS

1. The decree was not a default judgment because Husband was represented by counsel at the final trial; a party's failure to appear personally does not create a default when the party's attorney appears and participates.
2. Any complaint about inadequate notice was waived because Husband's attorney appeared, announced ready, and proceeded to trial without objecting to the notice.
3. The appellate court could not review evidentiary-sufficiency or abuse-of-discretion complaints dependent on the trial evidence without a reporter's record; it therefore presumed that sufficient evidence supported the trial court's conservatorship, possession-and-access, and child-support rulings.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because he was represented by counsel, there was no default.” (5)

“Instead, when there is no reporter’s record, we must presume the trial court heard sufficient evidence to make all necessary findings in support of the judgment.” (8)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Husband and Wife married in 2018 and have two children. Wife filed for divorce in 2022, Husband answered, and the Office of the Attorney General intervened while an amicus attorney was appointed for the children. At the October 1, 2024 final trial, Husband did not appear physically but was represented by counsel, who appeared and announced ready. The decree appointed Wife sole managing conservator, denied Husband possession and

access based on a finding that access would endanger the children, and ordered Husband to pay \$1,015 per month in child support along with medical support.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Wife initiated divorce proceedings in 2022, and Husband filed an answer. The Office of the Attorney General intervened, and an amicus attorney was appointed for the children. After a final trial on October 1, 2024, the trial court entered a final divorce decree. Husband filed a combined motion to set aside the judgment and motion for new trial, but the record contained no ruling on those motions. On appeal, Husband did not obtain or arrange payment for the reporter's record, and the appellate court affirmed after overruling all three issues.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Sedona Pac. Hous. P'ship v. Ventura, 408 S.W.3d 507, 511–12 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2013, no pet.)
- LeBlanc v. LeBlanc, 778 S.W.2d 865, 865 (Tex. 1989)
- In re K.C., 88 S.W.3d 277, 279 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2002, pet. denied)
- Craddock v. Sunshine Bus Lines, 133 S.W.2d 124 (Tex. 1939)
- Morales v. Marquis, No. 13-12-00407-CV, 2013 WL 2298469, at *2 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg May 23, 2013, no pet.) (mem. op.)
- Johnson v. Mohammed, No. 03-10-00763-CV, 2013 WL 1955862, at *4 (Tex. App.—Austin May 10, 2013, pet. dismissed w.o.j.) (mem. op.)
- Custom-Crete, Inc. v. K-Bar Servs., Inc., 82 S.W.3d 655, 658 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2002, no pet.)
- Szanyi v. Gibson, No. 01-15-00895-CV, 2016 WL 3269975, at *3 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] June 14, 2016, no pet.) (mem. op.)
- Christiansen v. Prezelski, 782 S.W.2d 842, 843 (Tex. 1990)
- In re T.R.H., No. 04-18-00834-CV, 2019 WL 6887143, at *2 (Tex. App.—San Antonio Dec. 18, 2019, no pet.) (mem. op.)
- In re L.C.H., 80 S.W.3d 689, 691 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2002, no pet.)
- Matter of Marriage of Featherston, 675 S.W.3d 330, 333 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2023, no pet.)
- Ayala v. Ayala, 387 S.W.3d 721, 726 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2012, no pet.)
- Dunlap v. City of Fort Worth, No. 02-21-00130-CV, 2021 WL 5028767, at *4 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Oct. 28, 2021, no pet.) (mem. op.)
- Willms v. Ams. Tire Co., 190 S.W.3d 796, 803 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2006, pet. denied)
- In re M.D.G., 527 S.W.3d 299, 304 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2017, no pet.)
- Bryant v. United Shortline Inc. Assurance Servs., 972 S.W.2d 26, 31 (Tex. 1998)
- Caldwell v. Goodfellow Caldwell, No. 03-10-00292-CV, 2012 WL 5476848, at *2 (Tex. App.—Austin Nov. 8, 2012, pet. denied) (mem. op.)

- Sam F. v. Hamamiyah, No. 02-14-00109-CV, 2014 WL 6493588, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Nov. 20, 2014, no pet.) (mem. op.)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/court-of-appeals-second-appellate-district-of-texas-at-fort-worth-court-of-appeals-second-appellate/2026/kellus-joseph-bravo-v-corraima-bravo-do2qqcm0>