

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

In re Matthew Adrian Alirol

No. 13-26-00243-CV (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg May 12, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. 13-26-00243-CV ·
Decided May 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The Thirteenth Court of Appeals of Texas denied Matthew Adrian Alirol’s petition for writ of mandamus challenging a trial court order granting a new trial after an agreed divorce. The court held that the order was not void and that the record did not demonstrate extraordinary circumstances making appeal inadequate, and it lifted the previously imposed stay.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Texas, Thirteenth District, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Justice Jenny Cron; Chief Justice Tijerina; Justice West; Justice Cron
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Texas, Thirteenth District, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
DECIDED	May 12, 2026
DOCKET	13-26-00243-CV
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for writ of mandamus challenging the trial court's order granting a new trial after the parties entered an agreed divorce that the trial court approved.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandamus is an extraordinary and discretionary remedy. The relator must establish a clear abuse of discretion and the absence of an adequate remedy by appeal. A court abuses its discretion when no evidence supports the finding underlying its ruling or when the court could reasonably have reached only a contrary conclusion. Adequacy of appellate relief is assessed through a benefits-and-detriments analysis.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion; precedential status is not otherwise specified in the opinion text.

PARTIES

Matthiew Adrian Alirol, relator v. Amanda Williams, real party in interest

TOPICS

family law procedure

appellate procedure

standard of review

remedies

dissolution of marriage

PRACTICE AREAS

Family law

Appellate procedure

Mandamus

Remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court clearly abused its discretion by granting a new trial after approving the parties' agreed divorce.
2. Whether Alirol lacked an adequate remedy by appeal so as to justify mandamus relief from the new-trial order.
3. Whether the new-trial order was void or involved extraordinary circumstances warranting mandamus review.

HOLDINGS

1. A relator ordinarily must show both that the trial court clearly abused its discretion and that the relator lacks an adequate remedy by appeal.
2. An order granting a new trial following a bench trial ordinarily may be reviewed adequately on appeal, absent extraordinary circumstances.
3. Alirol did not establish entitlement to mandamus relief because the new-trial order was not void and the record did not show extraordinary circumstances making appeal inadequate.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The relator must ordinarily show that: (1) the trial court committed a clear abuse of discretion; and (2) the relator lacks an adequate remedy on appeal.” (at 1)

“However, a remedy by appeal is ordinarily adequate for an order granting a new trial following a bench trial.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties entered an agreed divorce that was approved by the trial court. The trial court subsequently granted a new trial. Alirol contended that granting the new trial was an abuse of discretion and that he lacked an adequate remedy by appeal. The appellate record did not show that the order was void or that extraordinary circumstances rendered appellate relief inadequate.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The trial court approved an agreed divorce and later granted a new trial. Alirol sought mandamus relief in the Thirteenth Court of Appeals, arguing that the trial court abused its discretion and that appeal was not an adequate remedy. The court lifted its previously imposed stay and denied the petition, concluding that the challenged order was not void and that no extraordinary circumstances made appellate relief inadequate.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- In re K & L Auto Crushers, LLC, 627 S.W.3d 239, 247 (Tex. 2021) (orig. proceeding)
- In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am., 148 S.W.3d 124, 135–38 (Tex. 2004) (orig. proceeding)
- Walker v. Packer, 827 S.W.2d 833, 839–40 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding)
- In re Dallas HERO, 698 S.W.3d 242, 247 (Tex. 2024) (orig. proceeding)
- In re H.E.B. Grocery Co., 492 S.W.3d 300, 302 (Tex. 2016) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam)
- In re AutoZoners, LLC, 694 S.W.3d 219, 223 (Tex. 2024) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam)
- In re Auburn Creek Ltd. P’ship, 655 S.W.3d 837, 843 (Tex. 2022) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam)
- In re Lapuerta, No. 24-0879, 2026 WL 969263, at *3 (Tex. App. 10, 2026) (orig. proceeding)
- In re Rudolph Auto., LLC, 674 S.W.3d 289, 298 n.5 (Tex. 2023) (orig. proceeding)
- In re Columbia Med. Ctr. of Las Colinas, Subsidiary, L.P., 290 S.W.3d 204, 209–10 (Tex. 2009) (orig. proceeding)
- In re Hardy, No. 08-26-00095-CV, 2026 WL 1096282, at *2 (Tex. App.—El Paso Apr. 22, 2026, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.)
- In re Velasquez, No. 04-25-00091-CV, 2025 WL 1063434, at *1 (Tex. App.—San Antonio Apr. 9, 2025, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.)
- In re Ramos, No. 13-20-00429-CV, 2021 WL 1177613, at *2 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg Mar. 29, 2021, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.)