

NO. 12-10-00228-CV

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

***IN THE INTEREST OF
M.K., C.K.
AND H.K.,
MINOR CHILDREN***

§ *APPEAL FROM THE 402ND*

§ *JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF*

§ *WOOD COUNTY, TEXAS*

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Tracy Knight attempts to appeal from an order holding her in contempt and confining her for failing to pay court ordered child support.

A contempt order is reviewable only by a petition for writ of habeas corpus (if the person in contempt is confined) or a petition for writ of mandamus (if no confinement is involved). *Cadle Co. v. Lobingier*, 50 S.W.3d 662, 671 (Tex. App.–Fort Worth 2001, pet. denied) (citing *In re Long*, 984 S.W.2d 623, 625 (Tex. 1999) (orig. proceeding)). We have no jurisdiction to review contempt orders by direct appeal. *Tex. Animal Health Comm'n v. Nunley*, 647 S.W.2d 951, 952 (Tex. 1983); *Ex parte Cardwell*, 416 S.W.2d 382, 384 (Tex. 1967) (orig. proceeding); *Wagner v. Warnasch*, 156 Tex. 334, 339, 295 S.W.2d 890, 893 (1956).

On July 22, 2010, this court notified Appellant that her notice of appeal does not show this court's jurisdiction in that it does not refer to and is not accompanied by a final judgment or appealable order. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 37.1. Appellant was further informed that the appeal would be dismissed unless the information received in the appeal was amended on or before August 23, 2010 to show this court's jurisdiction. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 37.1, 42.3. Appellant responded by providing a file marked copy of the "Order

Holding Respondent in Contempt” and the “Commitment Order.” However, these orders do not show the jurisdiction of this court. Accordingly, the appeal is *dismissed for want of jurisdiction*.

Opinion delivered August 4, 2010.

Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.

(PUBLISH)