

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT BEAUMONT

In re Scott Mitchell Obeginski

No. 09-26-00057-CV (Tex. App.—Beaumont Mar. 12, 2026) · No. 09-26-00057-CV · Decided March 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ninth Court of Appeals of Texas denied Scott Mitchell Obeginski’s petition for writ of mandamus challenging a sanctions order requiring him to attach highlighted copies of legal authorities cited in filings. The court held that the trial court had authority to impose the sanction, retained plenary power when it issued the order, and had not unconstitutionally restricted Obeginski’s access to the courts.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Golemon, C.J.; Wright, J.; Chambers, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
DECIDED	March 12, 2026
DOCKET	09-26-00057-CV
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original mandamus proceeding challenging a trial court sanctions order requiring the relator to attach highlighted copies of all cited legal authorities to future filings.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandamus requires a clear abuse of discretion and the absence of an adequate remedy by appeal. The validity of the sanctions order was assessed under the rule that sanctions must bear a direct relationship to the offensive conduct and must not be excessive.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Scott Mitchell Obeginski v. Joshua Want Real Estate Group, LLC

TOPICS

- sanctions
- writ of certiorari
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- appellate procedure
- mandamus
- sanctions
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court had authority to sanction Obeginski for citing fictional legal authority.
2. Whether the trial court had authority to require Obeginski to attach highlighted copies of cited legal authorities to filings made in any court.
3. Whether the sanctions order was void because the trial court lacked jurisdiction or had lost plenary power.
4. Whether the challenged directive unconstitutionally restricted Obeginski's access to the courts.
5. Whether Obeginski was entitled to mandamus relief.

HOLDINGS

1. The trial court possessed the authority to sanction Obeginski for citing fictitious legal authority in filings made in the underlying case because Obeginski had appeared and the court had personal jurisdiction over him and inherent power to sanction improper conduct.
2. The directive requiring Obeginski to attach highlighted copies of the authorities he cited was sufficiently related to his repeated citation of fictitious cases and was not shown to be an excessive sanction.
3. The sanctions order was not void because the trial court had jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter, had authority to enter the order, and acted while it retained plenary power.
4. Obeginski did not establish that the directive unconstitutionally restricted his access to the courts.
5. Mandamus relief was unavailable because Obeginski failed to show a clear abuse of discretion and an inadequate remedy by appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Generally, for a sanction to be just a direct relationship must exist between the offensive conduct and the sanction imposed, and it must not be excessive.” (at 4)

“We hold that the order is not void.” (at 5)

“Accordingly, we deny Relator’s petition for writ of mandamus.” (at 6)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Obeginski repeatedly cited fictitious cases in filings in the 284th District Court. The trial court sanctioned him and ordered that, whenever he filed a plea, pleading, motion, brief, or similar document in any court, he attach copies of all cited legal authorities and highlight the supporting portions. Obeginski had appeared in the underlying case, and the trial court signed the sanctions order while it retained plenary power over the case.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The 284th District Court of Montgomery County imposed sanctions after finding that Obeginski had cited fictional legal authority. The sanctions order required him to attach copies of cited authorities to filings made in any court. Obeginski moved to vacate the challenged portion of the order and sought mandamus relief, arguing

that the trial court lacked authority to issue the directive, had lost plenary power, and unconstitutionally restricted court access. The court of appeals denied the petition and denied pending motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- Eichelberger v. Eichelberger, 582 S.W.2d 395, 398-400 (Tex. 1979)
- Dubai Petroleum Co. v. Kazi, 12 S.W.3d 71, 76-77 (Tex. 2000)
- Mapco, Inc. v. Forrest, 795 S.W.2d 700, 703 (Tex. 1990) (orig. proceeding)
- Browning v. Placke, 698 S.W.2d 362, 363 (Tex. 1985) (orig. proceeding)
- Kelley v. Homminga, 706 S.W.3d 829, 833 (Tex. 2025)
- Reiss v. Reiss, 118 S.W.3d 439, 443 (Tex. 2003)
- TransAmerican Natural Gas Corp. v. Powell, 811 S.W.2d 913, 917 (Tex. 1991) (orig. proceeding)
- Miller v. Armogida, 877 S.W.2d 361, 364 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1994, writ denied)
- Scott & White Memorial Hospital v. Schexnider, 940 S.W.2d 594, 596 (Tex. 1996) (op. on reh'g)
- In re Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 148 S.W.3d 124, 135-36 (Tex. 2004) (orig. proceeding)
- Walker v. Packer, 827 S.W.2d 833, 839-40 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding)