

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

In re John James Harkins, et al.

In re Harkins · No. 13-12-00444-CV · Decided August 1, 2012

OPINION

in Re: John James Harkins

PER CURIAM.

NUMBER 13-12-00444-CV

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

IN RE JOHN JAMES HARKINS, ET AL. On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Chief Justice Valdez and Justices Garza and Vela Memorandum Opinion Per Curiam¹ Relators² have filed a petition for writ of mandamus in which they argue that respondent, the Honorable Stephen Williams, Presiding Judge of the 267th Judicial District Court of Goliad County, Texas, abused his discretion, leaving relators without an adequate appellate remedy, by denying relators’ “Motion to Secure Production Revenues in the Registry of the Court” on June 25, 2012. ¹ See TEX. R. APP. P. 47.4 (distinguishing opinions and memorandum opinions), 52.8(d) (“When denying relief, the court may hand down an opinion but is not required to do so.”). ² Relators are: John James Harkins; Delores Marie Harkins; Janey Francis Harkins Hiller; Allen Anthony Harkins; Patricia Ailene Harkins a/k/a Patricia Ailene O’Rear; Wilson William Harkins IV; Heath Alan Harkins; and Dynamic Production, Inc. Having reviewed and fully considered relators’ petition and the response filed by the real party in interest, North Shore Energy, L.L.C., we conclude that relators have not shown themselves entitled to the relief sought and the petition for writ of mandamus should be denied. Accordingly, the petition for writ of mandamus is DENIED.

PER CURIAM

Delivered and filed the 1st day of August, 2012. ²