

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST DISTRICT OF TEXAS

In re Ryen Michelle Staggers

No. 01-26-00300-CV · No. No. 01-26-00300-CV · Decided April 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The First Court of Appeals of Texas denied a pro se petition for writ of mandamus seeking an emergency stay and relief from a March 27, 2026 trial court order. The court concluded that the relator failed to provide the relevant trial court order in the mandamus record, preventing review of the asserted arguments, and dismissed pending motions as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Justice Gunn; Justice Caughey; Justice Morgan
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas
DECIDED	April 9, 2026
DOCKET	No. 01-26-00300-CV
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original proceeding on a pro se petition for writ of mandamus seeking an emergency stay and an order directing the trial court to vacate a March 27, 2026 order.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandamus relief was denied because the relator failed to provide the record necessary for the appellate court to evaluate the challenged order and failed to establish entitlement to mandamus relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Ryen Michelle Staggers, Relator v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- writ of certiorari
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- remedies
- family law procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- remedies
- family law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the relator was entitled to mandamus relief when the mandamus record and appendix did not include the challenged trial-court order.
2. Whether pending motions should be dismissed as moot after denial of the mandamus petition.

HOLDINGS

1. A relator is not entitled to mandamus relief when the mandamus record and appendix do not include a certified or sworn copy of the relevant trial-court order, preventing the appellate court from evaluating the asserted error.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, we conclude that relator has failed to establish she is entitled to mandamus relief, and therefore, the Court denies relator’s petition for writ of mandamus.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Staggers challenged a March 27, 2026 order entered in an underlying child-related proceeding. She alleged that the order resulted from an abuse of discretion, extrinsic fraud, and violations of due process, but her mandamus record did not contain a signed copy of the order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Staggers petitioned the First Court of Appeals for a writ of mandamus, asserting that the trial court abused its discretion and that its order was void because of extrinsic fraud and due-process violations. The court denied mandamus relief because the mandamus record and appendix did not include a copy of the challenged trial-court order, and it dismissed pending motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- In re State Farm Lloyds, No. 05-25-01224-CV, 2025 WL 2723146, at *1 (Tex. App.—Dallas Sept. 24, 2025, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.)

OPINION

In Re Ryen Michelle Staggers v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

Opinion issued April 9, 2026 In The Court of Appeals For The First District of Texas

NO. 01-26-00300-CV

IN RE RYEN MICHELLE STAGGERS, Relator Original Proceeding on Petition for Writ of Mandamus

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Relator, Ryen Michelle Staggers, proceeding pro se, filed a petition for writ of mandamus “seek[ing] an immediate [e]mergency [s]tay of the March 27, 2026 [trial court] [o]rder.”¹ Relator’s petition for writ of mandamus asserted that the trial court abused its discretion by signing the March 27, 2026 order. Relator therefore 1 The underlying case is In the Interest of M.K.S.-C, a Child, Cause No. 2025-77173, in the 257th District Court of Harris County, Texas, the Honorable Sandra Peake presiding. requested that this Court “[i]ssue an emergency order staying the enforcement of the March 27, 2026[] [o]rder . . . , stay all underlying proceedings in the [t]rial [c]ourt pending the resolution” of the petition, and to further grant her petition for writ of mandamus and direct the trial court to vacate the March 27, 2026 order “as void due to extrinsic fraud and the violation of [r]elator’s due process rights.” Relator’s mandamus record and appendix does not include an order signed by the trial court, dated March 27, 2026 or otherwise, so we are unable to study the order to address any arguments raised by relator. See TEX. R. APP. P. 52.3(l)(1)(B) (requiring relator to provide an appendix to petition for writ of mandamus including “a certified or sworn copy of the relevant trial court order”), 52.7(a); see also In re State Farm Lloyds, No. 05-25-01224-CV, 2025 WL 2723146, at *1 (Tex. App.— Dallas Sept. 24, 2025, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.) (denying mandamus relief “[b]ecause the mandamus record d[id] not include a copy of the trial court’s order”). Accordingly, we conclude that relator has failed to establish she is entitled to mandamus relief, and therefore, the Court denies relator’s petition for writ of mandamus. We dismiss any pending motions as moot.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Justices Gunn, Caughey, and Morgan. 2