



NUMBER 13-22-00064-CV

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

CLAUDIA ISLEM DECIGA,

Appellant,

v.

PAVECON LTD., CO.

Appellee.

**On appeal from the 103rd District Court
of Cameron County, Texas.**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Justices Longoria, Hinojosa, and Silva
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Longoria**

Appellant Claudia Islem Deciga attempted to appeal the trial court's order granting Pavecon Ltd., Co.'s motion for summary judgment in this case. 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. "[A]n order or judgment is not final for purposes of appeal unless it actually disposes of every pending claim and party or unless it clearly and unequivocally states that it finally disposes of all claims and parties." *Lehmann v. Har-*

Con Corp., 39 S.W.3d 191, 205 (Tex. 2001). Pavecon Public Works GP LLC, Pavecon LTD, Do. and H-E-B, LP are each listed as defendants in the underlying cause, but the trial court's order only granted summary judgment and dismissed Pavecon Public Works GP LLC and Pavecon Ltd., Co. Appellant filed responses to the defect notice, but the responses did not cure the defect; the jurisdictional defect of a no final, appealable order remains.

Absent an appealable interlocutory order or final judgment, this Court has no jurisdiction over this appeal. See *Ogletree v. Matthews*, 262 S.W.3d 316, 319 n. 1 (Tex. 2007); *Lehmann*, 39 S.W.3d at 195. The Court, having considered the documents on file, both appellant and appellee's responses and replies to the defect notice, 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. See TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a). Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for want of jurisdiction. See *id.* R. 42.3(a),(c).

NORA L. LONGORIA
Justice

Delivered and filed on the
5th day of May, 2022.