

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

In re Raymond E. Carr

No. 03-26-00555-CV · No. 03-26-00555-CV · Decided June 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals for the Third District denied Raymond E. Carr’s petition for writ of mandamus seeking to compel the Harris County district clerk to file and docket his lawsuit. The court held that it lacked mandamus jurisdiction because Harris County is outside the court’s district and Carr had not shown that the writ was necessary to enforce the court’s jurisdiction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Texas Court of Appeals, Third District, at Austin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karin Crump; Chief Justice Byrne; Justice Theofanis; Justice Crump
JURISDICTION	Texas Court of Appeals, Third District at Austin
DECIDED	June 24, 2026
DOCKET	03-26-00555-CV
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original proceeding seeking mandamus relief directing the Harris County district court clerk to file and docket a lawsuit.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Raymond E. Carr v. District court clerk for Harris County

TOPICS

- appellate jurisdiction
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Appellate practice
- Mandamus

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the Third Court of Appeals had statutory mandamus jurisdiction over an original proceeding arising from Harris County.
- Whether Carr demonstrated that issuing a writ was necessary to enforce the Third Court of Appeals' jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The Third Court of Appeals lacked jurisdiction to issue a writ of mandamus against a trial-court official in an original proceeding from Harris County because Harris County is outside the court's district.
2. Carr did not establish that exercising the court's writ power was necessary to enforce the court's jurisdiction.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Raymond E. Carr asked the Third Court of Appeals to direct the Harris County district court clerk to file and docket his lawsuit. The requested relief concerned an original proceeding arising from Harris County, which is outside the counties within the Third Court of Appeals' district.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Raymond E. Carr filed a petition for writ of mandamus in the Third Court of Appeals. Because the underlying proceeding arose from Harris County, outside the Third Court's district, and because Carr did not show that mandamus was necessary to enforce the court's jurisdiction, the court denied the petition.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

OPINION

In Re Raymond E. Carr v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-26-00555-CV

In re Raymond E. Carr

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING FROM HARRIS COUNTY

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Raymond E. Carr has filed a petition for writ of mandamus asking this Court to direct the district court clerk for Harris County to file and docket his lawsuit. This Court's mandamus jurisdiction is expressly limited by statute to: (1) writs against a trial court judge in this Court's district, and (2) all writs necessary to enforce our jurisdiction. See Tex. Gov't Code § 22.221. As to the former, the Third Court of Appeals has jurisdiction of appeals from the trial courts located in Bastrop, Bell, Blanco, Burnet, Caldwell, Coke, Comal, Concho, Fayette, Hays, Irion, Lampasas, Lee, Llano, McCulloch, Milam, Mills, Runnels, San Saba, Schleicher, Sterling, Tom Green, Travis, and Williamson counties. See *id.* § 22.201(d). This is an original proceeding from Harris County. See *id.* § 22.221. Thus, we have no jurisdiction to issue a writ of mandamus outside this Court's district. See *id.* As to the latter, Relator has not demonstrated that the exercise of our writ power is necessary to enforce our jurisdiction in this case. Therefore, Relator has not established that we

have jurisdiction to issue the writ he seeks. For these reasons, the petition for writ of mandamus is denied. See Tex. R. App. P. 52.8(a). _____ Karin Crump, Justice Before Chief Justice Byrne, Justices Theofanis and Crump Filed: June 24, 2026 2