



NUMBER 13-18-00064-CV

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI - EDINBURG

CLAUDIA ROSENDA DE LA GARZA,

Appellant,

v.

CESAR PRAXEDIS DE LA GARZA,

Appellee.

**On appeal from the 197th District Court
of Cameron County, Texas.**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Chief Justice Valdez and Justices Benavides and Longoria
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Longoria**

Appellant Claudia Rosenda De La Garza, proceeding pro se, attempted to perfect an appeal from an order entered by the 197th District Court on January 24, 2018, granting the motion to consolidate filed by appellee Cesar Praxedis De La Garza. The order consolidates cause number 2008-03-1460-C in the 197th District Court of Cameron County into a divorce proceeding pending in cause number 2017-FAM-0709-C in the 94th District Court of Nueces County, Texas.

Upon review of the documents before the Court, it appeared that the order from which this appeal was taken was not a final appealable order. On February 23, 2018, the Clerk of this Court notified appellant of this defect so that steps could be taken to correct the defect, if it could be done. See TEX. R. APP. P. 37.1, 42.3. Appellant was advised that, if the defect was not corrected within ten days from the date of receipt of this notice, the appeal would be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Appellant did not file a response to the Clerk's notice.

Generally, appeals may be taken only from final judgments. See *City of Watauga v. Gordon*, 434 S.W.3d 586, 588 (Tex. 2014); *Lehmann v. Har-Con Corp.*, 39 S.W.3d 191, 195 (Tex. 2001). Appellate courts have jurisdiction to consider appeals of interlocutory orders only if a statute explicitly provides for such an appeal. *Tex. A & M Univ. Sys. v. Koseoglu*, 233 S.W.3d 835, 840 (Tex. 2007); see *City of Watauga*, 434 S.W.3d at 588; *Bally Total Fitness Corp. v. Jackson*, 53 S.W.3d 352, 352 (Tex. 2001); *Jack B. Anglin Co., Inc. v. Tipps*, 842 S.W.2d 266, 272 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding).

The Court, having considered the documents on file and appellant's failure to correct the defect in this matter, is of the opinion that the appeal should be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. The order at issue in this case is neither a final judgment nor an interlocutory appeal authorized by statute. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for want of jurisdiction. See TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a),(c). All pending motions or requests for relief are likewise dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

NORA L. LONGORIA
Justice

Delivered and filed the
7th day of June, 2018.