

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST DISTRICT OF TEXAS

In re Hollie Kleitz

No. 01-26-00477-CV · No. 01-26-00477-CV · Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The First Court of Appeals of Texas denied Hollie Kleitz’s petition for a writ of mandamus challenging two trial court orders concerning judgment on the pleadings and an opposing party’s amended answer. The court also denied her request for emergency relief staying trial and dismissed any pending motion as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Justice Gunn; Justice Caughey; Justice Morgan
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas
DECIDED	May 8, 2026
DOCKET	01-26-00477-CV
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original proceeding on Hollie Kleitz's petition for writ of mandamus challenging two trial-court orders and seeking emergency relief to stay trial.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Hollie Kleitz v. State of Texas

TOPICS

appellate procedure remedies motion for judgment on the pleadings motion to amend civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure appellate procedure remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Kleitz was entitled to mandamus relief directing the trial court to vacate its orders denying her motion for judgment on the pleadings or to deem allegations admitted and granting Avi Ron leave to amend his answer.

2. Whether emergency relief staying the underlying trial was warranted.

HOLDINGS

1. Kleitz failed to establish that she was entitled to mandamus relief, so the court denied her petition.
2. Emergency relief was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We conclude that relator has failed to establish she is entitled to mandamus relief, and therefore, the Court denies relator’s petition for writ of mandamus.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In the underlying case, Avi Ron sued Hollie Kleitz and Quasar Development, Inc. in the 113th District Court of Harris County. Kleitz sought mandamus relief from two orders signed on May 6, 2026: one denying her motion for judgment on the pleadings or to deem allegations admitted, and another granting Ron leave to amend his answer. Trial in the underlying case had begun when Kleitz filed her mandamus petition.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Kleitz challenged an order denying her motion for judgment on the pleadings or, alternatively, to deem allegations admitted, and an order granting Avi Ron leave to amend his answer. She asked the court of appeals to direct the trial court to vacate the orders and to stay the underlying trial, which had already commenced. The court denied mandamus relief, denied emergency relief, and dismissed pending motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied