

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

In the Matter of the Marriage of Michael Weikman and Premlata
Jowata Weikman

No. 13-25-00483-CV (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg Dec. 11, 2025) · No. 13-25-00483-CV · Decided
December 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The Thirteenth Court of Appeals of Texas dismissed Michael Lee Weikman’s attempted appeal from a purported final divorce decree. The court concluded that no final, appealable order appeared in the record and dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction after the appellant failed to cure the defect.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Texas, Thirteenth District, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Justice Clarissa Silva; Justice Silva; Justice Cron; Justice Fonseca
JURISDICTION	Thirteenth Court of Appeals of Texas, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
DECIDED	December 11, 2025
DOCKET	13-25-00483-CV
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Michael Lee Weikman attempted to appeal from an asserted final decree of divorce. The court of appeals dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction because the record contained no final decree of divorce or other final, appealable order, and appellant failed to cure the defect after notice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed its appellate jurisdiction based on the record and whether a final, appealable order existed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Michael Lee Weikman

TOPICS

- appellate jurisdiction
- final judgment rule
- appellate procedure
- family law procedure
- divorce

PRACTICE AREAS

family law

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court of appeals had jurisdiction over an attempted appeal when the record contained no final decree of divorce or other final, appealable order.
2. Whether the appeal should be dismissed after appellant failed to cure the identified jurisdictional defect within the time allowed.

HOLDINGS

1. The court lacked appellate jurisdiction because the documents before it contained no final decree of divorce or other final, appealable order.
2. The appeal was dismissed for want of jurisdiction because appellant failed to respond to the clerk's notice or otherwise correct the defect.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for want of jurisdiction.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Michael Lee Weikman attempted to appeal what he characterized as a final decree of divorce signed on September 25, 2025. The appellate record contained no final decree of divorce or other final, appealable order. After receiving notice of the defect, Weikman neither responded nor corrected the jurisdictional deficiency.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The appeal arose from Nueces County trial court cause number 2023-FAM-3053-H. Appellant asserted that a final divorce decree had been signed on September 25, 2025, but the appellate court found no final decree or other final, appealable order in the documents before it. After the clerk notified appellant of the jurisdictional defect and allowed ten days to correct it, appellant did not respond or otherwise cure the defect. The court therefore dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

OPINION

In the Matter of the Marriage of Michael Weikman and Premlata Jowata Weikman v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

NUMBER 13-25-00483-CV

COURT OF APPEALS
THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

IN THE MATTER OF THE MARRIAGE OF
MICHAEL WEIKMAN AND PREMLATA JOWATA WEIKMAN

ON APPEAL FROM THE 347TH DISTRICT COURT
OF NUECES COUNTY, TEXAS

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Justices Silva, Cron, and Fonseca Memorandum Opinion by Justice Silva Appellant Michael Lee Weikman attempted to appeal a final decree of divorce signed on September 25, 2025 in trial court cause number 2023-FAM-3053-H. Upon review of the documents before this Court, it appears there is no final decree of divorce nor other final, appealable order. On October 9, 2025, the Clerk of the Court notified appellant of this defect so that steps could be taken to correct the defect, if it could be done. See TEX. R. APP. P. 37.1, 42.3. Appellant was advised that, if the defect was not corrected within ten days from the date of receipt of this notice, the appeal would be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Appellant failed to respond to the Court's notice or otherwise cure this defect. The Court, having considered the documents on file and appellant's failure to correct the defect in this matter, is of the opinion that the appeal should be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. See *id.* R. 42.3(a). Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for want of jurisdiction. See *id.*

CLARISSA SILVA

Justice Delivered and filed on the 11th day of December, 2025. 2