

**Petition for Writ of Mandamus Denied and Memorandum Opinion filed November 18, 2010.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-10-01060-CR**

---

**ERIK LAWSON, Relator**

---

---

**ORIGINAL PROCEEDING  
WRIT OF MANDAMUS  
176th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 1243460**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

On October 29, 2010, relator filed a petition for writ of mandamus in this court. *See* Tex. Gov't Code Ann. § 22.221 (Vernon 2004); *see also* Tex. R. App. P. 52. Relator complains that respondent, the Honorable Shawna Reagin, presiding judge of the 176th District Court of Harris County, has denied his motion for hybrid representation.

To be entitled to mandamus relief, a relator must show that he has no adequate remedy at law to redress his alleged harm, and what he seeks to compel is a ministerial act,

not involving a discretionary or judicial decision. *State ex rel. Young v. Sixth Judicial Dist. Court of Appeals at Texarkana*, 236 S.W.3d 207, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007) (orig.proceeding).

Because there is no absolute right to hybrid representation, a trial court's ruling on such representation is not a ministerial act but discretionary. *See Ganther v. State*, 187 S.W.3d 641, 648 (Tex. App. -- Houston [14th Dist.] 2006, pet. ref'd) (citing *Montgomery v. State*, 810 S.W.2d 372, 391 (Tex.Crim.App.1990)). Accordingly, we deny relator's petition for writ of mandamus.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Justices Seymore, Boyce, and Christopher.

Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).