

**In The**  
***Court of Appeals***  
***Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont***

---

**NO. 09-17-00297-CV**

---

**IN RE COMMITMENT OF CHARLES ANTHONY WILLIAMS**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 435th District Court**  
**Montgomery County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause No. 08-11-10820-CV**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Charles Anthony Williams was determined to be a sexually violent predator and committed for sex offender treatment. *See In re Commitment of Williams*, No. 09-09-00515-CV, 2010 WL 5550663, at \*1 (Tex. App.—Beaumont Oct. 21, 2010, pet. denied) (mem. op.). On July 13, 2017, the trial court signed an order denying Williams’s motion for change of venue. Williams filed a notice of appeal. We questioned our jurisdiction and the parties filed responses.

Generally, appeals may be taken only from final judgments. *Lehmann v. Har-*

*Con Corp.*, 39 S.W.3d 191, 195 (Tex. 2001). Williams argues the order denying his motion for a change of venue disposed of all pending claims and parties. In a civil commitment case, however, the trial court retains jurisdiction while the commitment order remains in effect. *See In re Commitment of Cortez*, 405 S.W.3d 929, 932 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2013, no pet.). Williams has not identified a signed order by the trial court that is appealable at this time.<sup>1</sup>

In response to this Court’s suggestion that the appeal is frivolous, Williams argues that the appeal is not frivolous because he faces subsequent hearings that will be conducted in Montgomery County, and the potential jury pool might be tainted by individual members’ previous jury service in civil commitment proceedings. Williams’s response reveals that his response to this Court’s inquiry regarding jurisdiction, which claimed the venue ruling was the final ruling in the case, was less than forthcoming regarding the true status of the litigation. We conclude that the appeal is frivolous. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 45. In the event Williams files a frivolous appeal with this Court in the future, the Court will consider imposing sanctions. *See id.*

---

<sup>1</sup>Williams requests that we consider his response as a mandamus petition, but neither the form nor the substance of the response presents a valid basis for granting mandamus relief. *See generally* Tex. R. App. P. 52. Accordingly, the request is denied.

The appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a);  
43.2(f).

APPEAL DISMISSED.

---

CHARLES KREGER  
Justice

Submitted on August 30, 2017  
Opinion Delivered August 31, 2017

Before Kreger, Horton, and Johnson, JJ.