

FOURTH COURT OF APPEALS OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

Bianca Fox v. Cypress at Stone Oak

No. 04-26-00120-CV · No. No. 04-26-00120-CV · Decided April 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The Fourth Court of Appeals of San Antonio dismissed Bianca Fox’s appeal for lack of jurisdiction. The court determined that no final judgment or appealable interlocutory order had been signed, and that the orders concerning protection and subpoena compliance were not appealable; all pending motions were denied as moot.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Fourth Court of Appeals San Antonio, Texas MEMORANDUM OPINION No. 04-26-00120-CV Bianca FOX, Appellant v. CYPRESS at Stone Oak, Appellee From the County Court at Law No. 3, Bexar County, Texas Trial Court No. 2023-CV-01033 Honorable David J. Rodriguez, Judge Presiding PER CURIAM Sitting: Rebeca C. Martinez, Chief Justice Irene Rios, Justice Lori I. Valenzuela, Justice Delivered and Filed: April 8, 2026 DISMISSED FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION On February 12, 2026, appellant Bianca Fox, proceeding pro se, filed a notice of appeal purporting to appeal a turnover order signed on January 30, 2026.

The clerk’s record contains no turnover order signed on January 30, 2026. Instead, the clerk’s record contains two interlocutory orders signed on January 30, 2026, those being: (1) an order denying Fox’s motion for protection, and (2) an order requiring Fox to comply with a subpoena. It appears that Fox intends to appeal from these interlocutory orders. See *Pelt v. State Bd.*

Of Ins., 802 S.W.2d 822, 826 (Tex. App.— 04-26-00120-CV Austin 1990, no writ) (holding that an order denying a motion to quash subpoena is not appealable); see also *RWLS L.L.C. v. Gray Wireline Service, Inc.*, 359 S.W.3d 927, 928 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2012, pet. denied) (per curiam, sub. op. on reh’g) (holding that an order denying stay and compelling compliance with subpoena is not appealable). “Unless specifically authorized by statute, Texas appellate courts have jurisdiction only to review final judgments.” *McFadin v. Broadway Coffeehouse, LLC*, 539 S.W.3d 278, 283 (Tex.

2018). Accordingly, this court ordered appellant to show cause in writing by March 18, 2026, why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Appellant has filed no response. Because neither a final judgment nor an interlocutory order that may afford an authorized

interlocutory appeal has been signed in the underlying cause, this appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

1 See TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a) (appellate court may dismiss an appeal for lack of jurisdiction).
PER CURIAM 1 All pending motions are denied as moot. -2-