

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