

**COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AT FORT WORTH**

Gary Taylor v. SeaHarbor Insurance and Mariam Abdalla

No. 02-26-00232-CV (Tex. App.—Fort Worth May 28, 2026) · No. 02-26-00232-CV · Decided May 28, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals for the Second Appellate District dismissed Gary Taylor’s appeal for want of jurisdiction. The court held that the order granting SeaHarbor Insurance’s Rule 91a motion did not dispose of Taylor’s claims against co-defendant Mariam Abdalla and was neither a final judgment nor an appealable interlocutory order.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In the Court of Appeals Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth
_____ No. 02-26-00232-CV _____ GARY
TAYLOR, Appellant V. SEAHARBOR INSURANCE AND MARIAM ABDALLA, Appellees On
Appeal from County Court at Law No. 1 Tarrant County, Texas Trial Court No. 2025-010054-1
Before Birdwell, Bassel, and Womack, JJ. Per Curiam Memorandum Opinion MEMORANDUM
OPINION Appellant Gary Taylor, proceeding pro se, attempts to appeal the trial court’s order
granting Appellee SeaHarbor Insurance’s Rule 91a motion to dismiss and dismissing Taylor’s
claims against SeaHarbor.

Because it is not a final judgment or an appealable interlocutory order, we dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. We have jurisdiction to consider appeals only from final judgments and from certain interlocutory orders made immediately appealable by statute. See *Lehmann v. Har-Con Corp.*, 39 S.W.3d 191, 195 (Tex. 2001); see also Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem.

Code § 51.014(a). A final judgment is one that disposes of every pending claim and party or that “clearly and unequivocally states that it finally disposes of all claims and all parties.” See *Lehmann*, 39 S.W.3d at 205. Unless a statutory exception applies, an order that does not dispose of all pending parties and claims remains interlocutory and unappealable until the trial court signs a final judgment.

See *id.* An order granting a Rule 91a motion to dismiss has not been designated as an appealable interlocutory order. See Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 51.014(a). Taylor sued SeaHarbor and another defendant, Mariam Abdalla.

The order from which Taylor attempts to appeal does not address Taylor's claims against Abdalla, and the trial court clerk has confirmed that Abdalla has not been disposed of but remains a pending party. After we received Taylor's notice of appeal, we notified him of our concern that we may not have jurisdiction over his appeal because the order from which he attempts to appeal does not appear to be a final judgment or an appealable interlocutory order.

We warned him that unless he filed a response by May 4, 2026, showing grounds for continuing the appeal, it could be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 44.3. Taylor did not file a response.

Because the order from which Taylor attempts to appeal is neither a final judgment nor an appealable interlocutory order, we dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 43.2(f); *Gaff v. PHH Mortg. Corp.*, No. 02-24- 00486-CV, 2025 WL 1478175, at *3 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth May 22, 2025, no pet.) (dismissing for want of jurisdiction appeal from order that granted Rule 91a motion to dismiss but did not dismiss all parties).

Per Curiam Delivered: May 28, 2026 3