

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

In re Fat Cat Boatworks, LLC

In re Fat Cat Boatworks · No. 13-26-00283-CV · Decided June 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The Thirteenth Court of Appeals of Texas denied Fat Cat Boatworks, LLC’s petition for writ of mandamus challenging the trial court’s joinder of claims. The court concluded that the relator had not established an abuse of discretion or the absence of an adequate remedy by appeal.

OPINION

In Re Fat Cat Boatworks, LLC v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

NUMBER 13-26-00283-CV

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

IN RE FAT CAT BOATWORKS, LLC

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Justices Silva, Peña, and Fonseca Memorandum Opinion by Justice Fonseca¹ By petition for writ of mandamus, relator Fat Cat Boatworks, LLC asserts that the trial court abused its discretion by allowing the joinder of claims and it lacks an adequate remedy by appeal. We deny the petition for writ of mandamus. A writ of mandamus is an extraordinary remedy that is available when the trial court 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). clearly abused its discretion and the party seeking relief lacks an adequate remedy on appeal. In re Ill. Nat’l Ins., 685 S.W.3d 826, 834 (Tex. 2024) (orig. proceeding); In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am., 148 S.W.3d 124, 138 (Tex. 2004) (orig. proceeding); Walker v. Packer, 827 S.W.2d 833, 839–40 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding). “A court abuses its discretion if no evidence supports the finding on which its ruling rests and if the court could reasonably have reached only a contrary conclusion.” In re AutoZoners, LLC, 694 S.W.3d 219, 223 (Tex. 2024) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam). We conduct a “benefits-and- detriments analysis” to determine if the relator possesses an adequate remedy at law. In re Auburn Creek Ltd. P’ship, 655 S.W.3d 837, 843 (Tex. 2022) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam); see In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am., 148 S.W.3d at 136–37.

The Court, having examined and fully considered the petition for writ of mandamus, the response filed by real party in interest Paul “Pablo” Benavides, relator’s reply thereto, the record, and the applicable law, is of the opinion that relator has not met its burden to obtain relief. Accordingly, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus.

YSMAEL D. FONSECA

Justice Delivered and filed on the 16th day of June, 2026. 2