

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, FOURTH DISTRICT, SAN ANTONIO

**Shamar D. Bradley v. The Connor Group, Julie Bray Patterson, and
Roberto A. Vazquez**

No. 04-25-00482-CV · No. No. 04-25-00482-CV · Decided May 20, 2026

OPINION

Shamar D. Bradley v. the Connor Group, Julie Bray Patterson, and Roberto A. Vazquez
PER CURIAM.

Fourth Court of Appeals San Antonio, Texas

MEMORANDUM OPINION

No. 04-25-00482-CV Shamar D. BRADLEY, Appellant v. THE CONNOR GROUP, Julie Bray
Patterson, and Roberto A. Vazquez, Appellees From the County Court at Law No. 3, Bexar
County, Texas Trial Court No. 2025-CV-01071 Honorable Lisa Jarrett, Judge Presiding
PER CURIAM

Sitting: Rebeca C. Martinez, Chief Justice Irene Rios, Justice Velia J. Meza, Justice Delivered and
Filed: May 20, 2026

DISMISSED AS MOOT

This interlocutory appeal arises from a suit against Judge Julie Bray Patterson 1 and Judge
Roberto A. Vasquez. 2 Because the appellant has filed a notice of nonsuit abandoning all claims,
we dismiss the appeal as moot. 1 Bexar County Justice of the Peace Precinct 3, Place 1. 2 Bexar
County Justice of the Peace Precinct 2, Place 1. 04-25-00482-CV

DISCUSSION

“We are obligated to consider our jurisdiction at all times,” and we lack jurisdiction when no live
controversy remains. *Morath v. Lewis*, 601 S.W.3d 785, 788 (Tex. 2020) (per curiam). Mootness
is a component of subject-matter jurisdiction that we review de novo. *Sw. Elec. Power Co. v.
Lynch*, 595 S.W.3d 678, 682 (Tex. 2020). A case becomes moot when the parties no longer have a
“personal stake in the outcome,” that is, a “concrete interest, however small.” Tex. Dep’t of
Family & Protective Servs. v. Grassroots Leadership, Inc., 717 S.W.3d 854, 875 (Tex. 2025)
(quoting *Campbell-Ewald Co. v. Gomez*, 577 U.S. 153, 161 (2016)). On February 7, 2025,
Shamar D. Bradley sued Judge Patterson, alleging “official oppression and abuse of authority”
arising from an eviction proceeding. After Judge Patterson recused, the case was transferred to
Judge Vasquez, whom Bradley then joined as a defendant. Both judges filed a plea to the
jurisdiction asserting governmental immunity, which the trial court granted. Bradley filed a notice
of interlocutory appeal on July 11, 2025. He later filed a notice nonsuiting “all claims herein
asserted by Shamar D. Bradley.” We ordered Bradley to show cause why the appeal should not be
dismissed as moot. In response, he contends the nonsuit is ineffective because it was not served on

appellees and that his motion for sanctions remains pending. A nonsuit is effective when filed and extinguishes the case or controversy as to the nonsuited claims, rendering interlocutory orders on the merits moot. *Univ. of Tex. Med. Branch at Galveston v. Estate of Blackmon*, 195 S.W.3d 98, 100–01 (Tex. 2006) (per curiam). Service is not required for the nonsuit to take effect. *Orion Invs., Inc. v. Dunaway & Assocs., Inc.*, 760 S.W.2d 371, 374 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1988, writ denied). -2- 04-25-00482-CV This interlocutory appeal concerns only the trial court’s ruling on appellees’ immunity. See TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 51.014(a)(8). Because Bradley has nonsuited all claims against appellees, no live controversy remains regarding that ruling. A pending sanctions request does not preserve a justiciable interest in the interlocutory order from which Bradley is appealing. Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal as moot. See *Speer v. Presbyterian Children’s Home & Serv. Agency*, 847 S.W.2d 227, 228 (Tex. 1993). All pending motions are denied.

PER CURIAM

-3-