

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT
AMARILLO

In the Matter of the Sam Richardson Revocable Living Trust v. the
State of Texas

No. 07-26-00173-CV · No. No. 07-26-00173-CV · Decided May 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The Seventh Court of Appeals of Texas dismissed Stacey Galloway Richardson’s pro se appeal from an order appointing a successor trustee. The court held that the notice of appeal was untimely and that it lacked authority to extend the deadline under the applicable appellate rules.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Parker, C.J.; Doss, J.; Yarbrough, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
DECIDED	May 1, 2026
DOCKET	No. 07-26-00173-CV
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appellant sought review of an order appointing a successor trustee. The court dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was untimely.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed its jurisdiction based on the timeliness of the notice of appeal and applicable appellate deadlines.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Stacey Galloway Richardson v. the State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate jurisdiction
- interlocutory appeal
- appellate procedure
- probate procedure
- trusts

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- probate
- trusts
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court of appeals had jurisdiction over an appeal from an interlocutory trustee-appointment order when the notice of appeal was filed after the twenty-day accelerated-appeal deadline.
2. Whether the court could grant appellant an extension of time to file the late notice of appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. A notice of appeal from the interlocutory order appointing a trustee was due within twenty days after the order was signed, and appellant's notice filed after that deadline did not invoke the court of appeals' jurisdiction.
2. The court lacked authority to grant appellant's requested extension because the request was made after the applicable deadline and the appellate court may not alter the time for perfecting a civil appeal; any available extension under Rule 26.3 is limited to fifteen days.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A timely notice of appeal is essential to invoking this Court’s jurisdiction.” (at 2)

“Because Appellant has not demonstrated grounds for continuing the appeal, we dismiss her untimely appeal for want of jurisdiction.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The trial court signed an order appointing a successor trustee on February 19, 2026. Stacey Galloway Richardson filed her notice of appeal on April 9, 2026, after the March 11, 2026 deadline for an accelerated appeal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The 181st District Court of Randall County signed its Order on First Amended Petition for Appointment of Successor Trustee on February 19, 2026. Because the order was subject to an accelerated appeal, the notice of appeal was due March 11, 2026, but appellant filed it on April 9, 2026. After the court notified appellant of the apparent untimeliness, she requested an extension, which the court denied, and the appeal was dismissed.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Verburgt v. Dorner*, 959 S.W.2d 615, 616–17 (Tex. 1997)

OPINION

In the Matter of the Sam Richardson Revocable Living Trust v. the State of Texas
PER CURIAM.

In The Court of Appeals Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo No. 07-26-00173-CV

IN THE MATTER OF THE SAM RICHARDSON REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST

On Appeal from the 181st District Court Randall County, Texas Trial Court No. 86721B,
Honorable Ron Enns, Presiding May 1, 2026

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before PARKER, C.J., and DOSS and YARBROUGH, JJ. Appellant, Stacey Galloway Richardson, proceeding pro se, appeals from the trial court's Order on First Amended Petition for Appointment of Successor Trustee. We dismiss the untimely appeal for want of jurisdiction. The trial court signed the Order on First Amended Petition for Appointment of Successor Trustee on February 19, 2026. Appellant's notice of appeal was, therefore, due within twenty days, by March 11, 2026. See TEX. R. APP. P. 26.1(b) (requiring a notice of appeal to be filed within twenty days after an order is signed in an accelerated appeal), 28.1(a) (accelerating appeals from interlocutory orders); TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 51.014(a)(1) (permitting interlocutory appeals from orders appointing trustees). Appellant did not file a notice of appeal until April 9, 2026. A timely notice of appeal is essential to invoking this Court's jurisdiction. See TEX. R. APP. P. 25.1(b), 26.1; *Verburgt v. Dorner*, 959 S.W.2d 615, 616–17 (Tex. 1997). By letter of April 13, 2026, we notified Appellant that her notice of appeal appeared untimely and directed her to show how we have jurisdiction over the appeal. Appellant has filed a response, requesting an extension of time to file the late notice of appeal. As we are without authority to grant such an extension, we must deny the request. See TEX. R. APP. P. 2 (prohibiting an appellate court from altering the time for perfecting an appeal in a civil case); 26.3 (allowing an appellate court to extend the time to file a notice of appeal by no more than fifteen days). Because Appellant has not demonstrated grounds for continuing the appeal, we dismiss her untimely appeal for want of jurisdiction. TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a). Per Curiam 2