



NUMBER 13-21-00153-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

IN RE RONALD KENWORTHY

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Justices Benavides, Hinojosa, and Silva
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Silva¹**

Relator Ronald Kenworthy, proceeding pro se, filed a petition for writ of mandamus in the above cause through which he requests that we direct the trial court to rule on a motion for nunc pro tunc judgment which relator filed on or about April 1, 2021. Relator asserts that the trial court's failure to respond to this motion will result in relator's continued incarceration for "an additional 415 days."

¹ See TEX. R. APP. P. 52.8(d) ("When denying relief, the court may hand down an opinion but is not required to do so. When granting relief, the court must hand down an opinion as in any other case."); *id.* R. 47.4 (distinguishing opinions and memorandum opinions).

To be entitled to mandamus relief, the relator must establish both that he has no adequate remedy at law to redress his alleged harm, and that what he seeks to compel is a purely ministerial act not involving a discretionary or judicial decision. *In re Harris*, 491 S.W.3d 332, 334 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016) (orig. proceeding); *In re McCann*, 422 S.W.3d 701, 704 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013) (orig. proceeding). If the relator fails to meet both requirements, then the petition for writ of mandamus should be denied. *State ex rel. Young v. Sixth Jud. Dist. Ct. of Apps. at Texarkana*, 236 S.W.3d 207, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007).

It is the relator's burden to properly request and show entitlement to mandamus relief. *Barnes v. State*, 832 S.W.2d 424, 426 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1992, orig. proceeding) (“Even a pro se applicant for a writ of mandamus must show himself entitled to the extraordinary relief he seeks.”); see generally TEX. R. APP. P. 52.3; *Lizcano v. Chatham*, 416 S.W.3d 862, 863 (Tex. Crim. App. 2011) (orig. proceeding) (Alcala, J. concurring); *Walker v. Packer*, 827 S.W.2d 833, 837 (Tex. 1992) (orig. proceeding). In addition to other requirements, the relator must include a statement of facts supported by citations to “competent evidence included in the appendix or record” and must also provide “a clear and concise argument for the contentions made, with appropriate citations to authorities and to the appendix or record.” See generally TEX. R. APP. P. 52.3(g), (h). The relator must furnish an appendix and record sufficient to support the claim for mandamus relief. See *id.* R. 52.3(k) (specifying the required contents for the appendix); *id.* R. 52.7(a) (specifying the required contents for the record).

The Court, having examined and fully considered the petition for writ of mandamus and the applicable law, is of the opinion that relator has not met his burden to obtain relief.

Relator has not filed either an appendix or record in support of his contentions in this original proceeding. Accordingly, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus. See *In re Harris*, 491 S.W.3d at 334; *In re McCann*, 422 S.W.3d at 704.

CLARISSA SILVA
Justice

Do not publish.
TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2 (b).

Delivered and filed on the
24th day of May, 2021.