

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

In re Antonio G. Cantu

No. 13-26-00338-CV (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg May 1, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. 13-26-00338-CV ·
Decided May 1, 2026

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

NUMBER 13-26-00338-CV COURT OF APPEALS THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG IN RE ANTONIO G. CANTU ON PETITION FOR WRIT
OF MANDAMUS MEMORANDUM OPINION Before Justices Silva, Peña, and Fonseca
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Fonseca¹ Relator Antonio G. Cantu filed a pro se petition for
writ of mandamus and a supplemental petition for writ of mandamus through which he asserts that
the trial court² 1 See TEX. R. APP.

P. 52.8(d) (“When denying relief, the court may hand down an opinion but is not required to do so.
When granting relief, the court must hand down an opinion as in any other case.”); id. R. 47.4
(distinguishing opinions and memorandum opinions). 2 This original proceeding arises from trial
court cause number 2025CI22843 in the 37th District Court of Bexar County, Texas.

This original proceeding and two others arising from this same trial court cause number were
transferred to this Court by order of the Texas Supreme Court. See Misc. Docket No. 26-9027
(Tex. Apr. 23, 2026). We dispose of the other two original proceedings by separate memorandum
abused its discretion in various respects by granting a motion to dismiss filed pursuant to Texas
Rule of Civil Procedure 91a.

See generally TEX. R. CIV. P. 91a.1–.9 (governing the dismissal of baseless causes of action). A
writ of mandamus is an extraordinary remedy available only when the trial court clearly abused its
discretion and the party seeking relief lacks an adequate remedy on appeal.

In re Ill. Nat’l Ins., 685 S.W.3d 826, 834 (Tex. 2024) (orig. proceeding); In re Prudential Ins. Co.
of Am., 148 S.W.3d 124, 138 (Tex. 2004) (orig. proceeding); Walker v. Packer, 827 S.W.2d 833,
839–40 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding).

The relator must ordinarily show that: (1) the trial court committed a clear abuse of discretion; and
(2) the relator lacks an adequate remedy on appeal. In re Dallas HERO, 698 S.W.3d 242, 247
(Tex. 2024) (orig. proceeding); In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am., 148 S.W.3d at 135–36; Walker v.
Packer, 827 S.W.2d 833, 839–40 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding). “The relator bears the burden of
proving these two requirements.” In re H.E.B.

Grocery Co., 492 S.W.3d 300, 302 (Tex. 2016) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam); Walker, 827 S.W.2d at 840; see also Barnes v. State, 832 S.W.2d 424, 426 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1992, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (“Even a pro se applicant for a writ of mandamus must show himself entitled to the extraordinary relief he seeks.”).

The Court, having examined and fully considered the petition for writ of mandamus, the supplemental petition for writ of mandamus, and the applicable law, is of the opinion opinions issued on this same date. See In re Cantu, No. 13-26-00336-CV, 2026 WL _____, at *_ (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg Apr. __, 2026, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.); In re Cantu, No. 13-26-00337- CV, 2026 WL _____, at *_ (Tex.

App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg Apr. __, 2026, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.). 2 that relator has not met his burden to obtain relief. Accordingly, we deny relator’s petition for writ of mandamus and supplemental petition for writ of mandamus. YSMAEL D. FONSECA Justice Delivered and filed on the 1st day of May, 2026. 3