

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT BEAUMONT

Francisco A. Salinas Hernandez v. Maria Nambo and Hector Nambo

Salinas Hernandez · No. 09-25-00342-CV · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ninth District Court of Appeals of Texas dismissed Francisco A. Salinas Hernandez’s appeal for want of prosecution. The court found that he failed to pay the appellate filing fee, did not file a statement of inability to pay costs, and failed to comply with the clerk’s notice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Golemon, C.J.; Johnson, J.; Chambers, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	09-25-00342-CV
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a post-judgment enforcement order in the 284th District Court of Montgomery County, Texas.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Francisco A. Salinas Hernandez v. Maria Nambo, Hector Nambo

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- costs
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the appeal should be dismissed for want of prosecution because Appellant failed to pay the appellate filing fee, failed to establish inability to pay costs, and failed to comply with the clerk's notice.

HOLDINGS

1. An appeal may be dismissed for want of prosecution when the appellant fails to pay the required filing fee, does not establish entitlement to proceed without payment of costs, and fails to comply with a clerk's notice requiring a response within a specified time.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Appellant sought review of a post-judgment enforcement order signed by the district court on August 28, 2025. The appellate clerk directed Appellant to pay the appeal filing fee and later provided a certified bill of costs. Despite notice that the appeal would be dismissed if the fee was not paid by the specified date, Appellant neither paid the fee nor filed a statement of inability to pay costs.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Appellant filed a notice of appeal from an August 28, 2025 post-judgment enforcement order. After the clerk issued an invoice and the court warned that the appeal would be dismissed if the filing fee was not paid, Appellant failed to pay the fee, did not file a statement of inability to pay costs, and failed to respond to the clerk's notice. The court dismissed the appeal for want of prosecution.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In The Court of Appeals Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont _____ NO. 09-25-00342-CV _____ FRANCISCO A. SALINAS HERNANDEZ, Appellant V. MARIA _____ NAMBO _____ AND _____ HECTOR _____ NAMBO, Appellees
_____ On Appeal
from the 284th District Court Montgomery County, Texas Trial Cause No. 22-09-12852

MEMORANDUM OPINION On September 11, 2025, Appellant Francisco A. Salinas Hernandez filed a notice of appeal from a post-judgment enforcement order signed on August 28, 2025, from the 284th District Court of Montgomery County, Texas.

Upon receiving the notice of appeal from Appellant, the Clerk of the Court issued an Invoice for the filing fee for the appeal. By letter dated October 27, 2025, we notified the parties that Appellant had not paid the filing fee as directed in our previous letter. A Certified Bill of Costs for the filing fee was enclosed and provided to Appellant. 1 We warned Appellant in our letter, dated

October 27, 2025, that unless the filing fee was paid, the appeal would be dismissed without further notice on any date after Wednesday, November 12, 2025.

See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(c). As of this date, Appellant has failed to pay the filing fee as directed by this Court. Appellant has not paid the filing fee for the appeal. Appellant did not file a statement of inability to pay costs in this matter and has not shown that he is entitled to proceed without payment of costs. See id. 20.1. Furthermore, Appellants failed to comply with a notice from the Clerk of the Court requiring a response within a specified time.

See id. 42.3(c). We dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution. See id. 42.3(b), 43.2(f). APPEAL DISMISSED. PER CURIAM Submitted on January 7, 2026 Opinion Delivered January 8, 2026 Before Golemon, C.J., Johnson and Chambers, JJ. 2