



**COURT OF APPEALS  
SECOND DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH**

**NO. 2-09-213-CV**

SHEZAD MALIK

APPELLANT

V.

THOMAS SLONE AND  
MICHAEL MEYER

APPELLEES

-----  
FROM THE 96TH DISTRICT COURT OF TARRANT COUNTY  
-----

**MEMORANDUM OPINION<sup>1</sup>**  
-----

Appellant Shezad Malik attempts to appeal from the trial court's May 22, 2009 interlocutory order, which granted the Appellees' motion to disqualify him. On July 24, 2009, we sent Malik a letter stating our concern that we may have no jurisdiction over this appeal because the order does not appear to be a final appealable order or judgment, nor does it appear to be an appealable interlocutory order. See Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. § 51.014(a)

---

<sup>1</sup> [See](#) Tex. R. App. P. 47.4.

(Vernon 2008) (listing appealable interlocutory orders); *Lehmann v. Har-Con Corp.*, 39 S.W.3d 191, 195 (Tex. 2001) (providing general rule that an appeal may be taken only from a final judgment). We indicated that this court would dismiss this appeal if we did not receive a response showing grounds for continuing the appeal by August 3, 2009. Malik filed a timely response, acknowledging that there is no interlocutory appeal available from the May 22, 2009 interlocutory order disposing of the disqualification motion.


Accordingly, because the order is neither a final judgment nor an appealable interlocutory order, we dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction.<sup>2</sup> See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 43.2(f).

SUE WALKER  
JUSTICE

PANEL: WALKER, MCCOY, and MEIER, JJ.

DELIVERED: August 20, 2009

---

<sup>2</sup>  Malik, in his response, requests a writ of mandamus. Because his response does not comply with the requisites for a petition for writ of mandamus, we have sent a noncompliance letter. Should Malik file a compliant petition for writ of mandamus, that petition will be filed in a separate cause number. This opinion addresses and finally disposes of the interlocutory appeal only.