NO. 12-13-00155-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

IN RE:	§	
COREY DARNELL WEBB,	Ş	ORIGINAL PROCEEDING
RELATOR	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION PER CURIAM

Gloria Webb, "For Corey D. Webb Under Power of Attorney," has filed a petition for writ of prohibition against the Honorable Kerry L. Russell, Judge of the 7th Judicial District Court, Smith County, Texas, and various other respondents, some of whom are unnamed. In her petition, Ms. Webb provides a Missouri address, but does not include information showing that she is an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Texas.

Subject to few exceptions, a person may not practice law in Texas unless the person is a member of the state bar. *See* TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 81.102 (West 2013). The "practice of law" includes representing an individual in a court. *Id.* § 81.101 (West 2013). A power of attorney designates another as the principal's "attorney in fact" or agent. TEX. PROB. CODE ANN. § 482 (West 2003). But the authorization to act as an attorney in fact under a power of attorney is not an authorization to practice law. *Newton v. Delespine*, No. 12-05-00113-CV, 2006 WL 3458829, at *5 (Tex. App.–Dec. 1, 2006, pet. denied). Because Ms. Webb has not shown that she is authorized to practice law in Texas, we cannot permit her to represent Corey D. Webb in this proceeding. Accordingly, the petition for writ of prohibition is *denied*.

Opinion delivered May 31, 2013.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



COURT OF APPEALS TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS JUDGMENT

MAY 31, 2013

NO. 12-13-00155-CR

COREY DARNELL WEBB,
Relator
v.
HON. MARK A. CALHOON,
Respondent

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING

ON THIS DAY came to be heard the petition for writ of prohibition filed by **COREY DARNELL WEBB**, who is the relator in Cause No. 007-1350-10, pending on the docket of the 7th Judicial District Court of Smith County, Texas. Said petition for writ of prohibition having been filed herein on May 13, 2013, and the same having been duly considered, because it is the opinion of this Court that a writ of prohibition should not issue, it is therefore CONSIDERED, ADJUDGED and ORDERED that the said petition for writ of prohibition be, and the same is, hereby **DENIED**.

By per curiam opinion.

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