

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

In re Antonio G. Cantu

No. 13-26-00336-CV (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg May 1, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. 13-26-00336-CV ·

Decided May 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The Thirteenth Court of Appeals of Texas considered Antonio G. Cantu’s pro se petitions for writ of mandamus challenging the trial court’s failure to disqualify the Texas Attorney General and an Assistant Attorney General as counsel. The court held that Cantu did not meet his burden to obtain mandamus relief and denied both petitions.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

NUMBER 13-26-00336-CV COURT OF APPEALS THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG IN RE ANTONIO G. CANTU ON PETITION FOR WRIT
OF MANDAMUS MEMORANDUM OPINION Before Justices Silva, Peña, and Fonseca
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Fonseca¹ Relator Antonio G. Cantu filed a pro se petition for writ of mandamus and a supplemental petition for writ of mandamus through which he asserts that the trial court² 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). 2 This original proceeding arises from trial court cause number 2025CI22843 in the 37th District Court of Bexar County, Texas.

This original proceeding and two others arising from this same trial court cause number were transferred to this Court by order of the Texas Supreme Court. See Misc. Docket No. 26-9027 (Tex. Apr. 23, 2026). We dispose of the other two original proceedings by separate memorandum opinions issued on this same date. See *In re Cantu*, No. 13-26-00337-CV, 2026 WL _____, at *_ (Tex. abused its discretion by failing to disqualify Ken Paxton, Attorney General of Texas, and Scot M. Graydon, Assistant Attorney General of Texas, as counsel in the underlying litigation).

A writ of mandamus is an extraordinary remedy available only when the trial court 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). 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. *In re Dallas HERO*, 698 S.W.3d 242, 247 (Tex. 2024) (orig. proceeding); *In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, 148 S.W.3d at 135–36; *Walker v. Packer*, 827 S.W.2d 833, 839–40 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding). “The relator bears the burden of proving these two requirements.” *In re H.E.B.*

Grocery Co., 492 S.W.3d 300, 302 (Tex. 2016) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam); *Walker*, 827 S.W.2d at 840; see also *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, the supplemental petition for writ of mandamus, and the applicable law, is of the opinion that relator has not met his burden to obtain relief.

Accordingly, we deny relator’s petition App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg Apr. __, 2026, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.); *In re Cantu*, No. 13-26-00338- CV, 2026 WL ____, at *_ (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg Apr. __, 2026, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.). 2 for writ of mandamus and supplemental petition for writ of mandamus. YSMAEL D. FONSECA Justice Delivered and filed on the 1st day of May, 2026.