

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRTEENTH DISTRICT, CORPUS CHRISTI–
EDINBURG

In re Reginald Callis

No. 13-26-00334-CR · No. 13-26-00334-CR · Decided April 28, 2026

SUMMARY

The Thirteenth Court of Appeals of Texas denied Reginald Callis’s pro se petition for a writ of mandamus. The court held that Callis did not establish entitlement to mandamus relief and noted that Texas habeas corpus proceedings under Code of Criminal Procedure article 11.07 are the exclusive remedy for felony post-conviction relief in state court.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Texas Court of Appeals, Thirteenth District, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Justice Clarissa Silva; Justice Peña; Justice Fonseca
JURISDICTION	Texas Court of Appeals, Thirteenth District, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
DECIDED	April 28, 2026
DOCKET	13-26-00334-CR
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original proceeding on a pro se petition for writ of mandamus arising from a felony criminal case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandamus relief requires the relator to establish both that the requested act is ministerial and nondiscretionary and that there is no adequate remedy at law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential; memorandum opinion designated not for publication under Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).
PARTIES	Reginald Callis, relator

TOPICS

- state post-conviction relief
- habeas corpus
- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- post-conviction relief
- appellate procedure
- mandamus

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Callis established entitlement to mandamus relief by showing that the act he sought to compel was ministerial and that he lacked an adequate remedy at law.
2. Whether mandamus was an available vehicle for Callis's felony post-conviction claims concerning the validity of his conviction and judgment.

HOLDINGS

1. A criminal-case relator is entitled to mandamus relief only upon showing that the requested act is ministerial and nondiscretionary and that no adequate remedy at law exists; Callis failed to satisfy this burden.
2. Article 11.07 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure provides the exclusive remedy in Texas state courts for felony post-conviction relief; mandamus therefore was not an available substitute for that procedure.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We further note that the habeas corpus procedure set out in Article 11.07 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure is the exclusive remedy for felony post-conviction relief in state courts.” (at 2)

“Even a pro se applicant for a writ of mandamus must show himself entitled to the extraordinary relief he seeks.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Reginald Callis challenged proceedings in a felony criminal case, asserting that the trial court could not convict him without a plea and that the resulting judgment was void. The claims arose from cause number 08-3-7806 in the 24th District Court of Jackson County. Callis had previously pursued a direct appeal and other proceedings involving the same cause number.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Callis sought mandamus relief, asserting that the trial court lacked authority to convict him without a plea and that mandamus could issue to challenge a void judgment. The claims arose from trial court cause number 08-3-7806 in the 24th District Court of Jackson County, Texas, from which Callis had previously pursued a direct appeal and other proceedings. The court denied the petition because Callis failed to establish entitlement to mandamus relief and because Article 11.07 habeas corpus is the exclusive state-court remedy for felony post-conviction relief.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- Ex parte Callis, No. 13-22-00264-CR, 2022 WL 3971792, at *1 n.1 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg Sept. 1, 2022, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication)
- In re Meza, 611 S.W.3d 383, 388 (Tex. Crim. App. 2020) (orig. proceeding)
- In re Harris, 491 S.W.3d 332, 334 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam)
- State ex rel. Young v. Sixth Jud. Dist. Ct. of Apps. at Texarkana, 236 S.W.3d 207, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007) (orig. proceeding)
- In re Pena, 619 S.W.3d 837, 839 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2021, orig. proceeding)
- Barnes v. State, 832 S.W.2d 424, 426 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1992, orig. proceeding) (per curiam)
- Padieu v. Ct. of Apps. of Tex., Fifth Dist., 392 S.W.3d 115, 117 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013) (orig. proceeding)
- In re Briscoe, 230 S.W.3d 196, 197 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2006, orig. proceeding)
- Calton v. Schiller, 498 S.W.3d 247, 252 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 2016, pet. denied)

OPINION

In Re Reginald Callis v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

NUMBER 13-26-00334-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

IN RE REGINALD CALLIS

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Justices Silva, Peña, and Fonseca Memorandum Opinion by Justice Silva¹ By pro se petition for writ of mandamus, relator Reginald Callis asserts that the trial court lacked the ability to convict him in the absence of a plea and that mandamus may issue on a void judgment. Relator’s complaints arise from trial court cause number 08-3-7806 in the 24th District Court of Jackson County, Texas. Relator has previously filed a direct appeal and other proceedings from this same trial court cause number. See, 1 See TEX. R. APP. P. 52.8(d) (“When denying relief, the court may hand down an opinion but is not required to do so. When granting relief, the court must hand down an opinion as in any other case.”); id. R. 47.4 (distinguishing opinions and memorandum opinions). e.g., Ex parte Callis, No. 13-22-00264-CR, 2022 WL 3971792, at *1 n.1 (Tex. App.— Corpus Christi–Edinburg Sept. 1, 2022, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication) (collecting cases). In a criminal case, to be entitled to mandamus relief, the relator must establish that the act sought to be compelled is a ministerial act that does not involve a discretionary or judicial decision, and that there is no adequate remedy at law to address the alleged harm. See In re Meza, 611 S.W.3d 383, 388 (Tex. Crim. App. 2020) (orig. proceeding); In re Harris, 491 S.W.3d 332, 334 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam). If the relator fails to meet both requirements, then the petition for writ of mandamus should be denied.

See *State ex rel. Young v. Sixth Jud. Dist. Ct. of Apps. at Texarkana*, 236 S.W.3d 207, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007) (orig. proceeding). It is the relator's burden to properly request and show entitlement to mandamus relief. See *id.*; *In re Pena*, 619 S.W.3d 837, 839 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2021, orig. proceeding); see also TEX. R. APP. P. 52.3, 52.7 (delineating the required form and contents for an original proceeding); *Barnes v. State*, 832 S.W.2d 424, 426 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1992, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (“Even a pro se applicant for a writ of mandamus must show himself entitled to the extraordinary relief he seeks.”). The Court, having examined and fully considered the petition for writ of mandamus and the applicable law, is of the opinion that relator has not met his burden to obtain relief. We further note that the habeas corpus procedure set out in Article 11.07 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure is the exclusive remedy for felony post-conviction relief in state courts. See TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. art. 11.07; *Padieu v. Ct. of Apps. of Tex., Fifth 2 Dist.*, 392 S.W.3d 115, 117 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013) (orig. proceeding); *In re Briscoe*, 230 S.W.3d 196, 197 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2006, orig. proceeding); see also *Calton v. Schiller*, 498 S.W.3d 247, 252 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 2016, pet. denied). Accordingly, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus.

CLARISSA SILVA

Justice Do not publish. TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2 (b). Delivered and filed on the 28th day of April, 2026. 3