



COURT OF APPEALS
EIGHTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
EL PASO, TEXAS

IN RE: REGGIE JACKSON,

Relator.

§
§
§
§
§
§

No. 08-21-00033-CV

AN ORIGINAL PROCEEDING

IN MANDAMUS

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Reggie Jackson has filed a writ of mandamus against the County Court at Law No. 2 and the County Court at Law No. 4 of Travis County and a motion for a stay of trial court proceedings. We deny the motion and dismiss this original proceeding for want of jurisdiction.

This is the latest in a series of appellate actions Jackson has brought ancillary to litigation over a protective order in two Travis County trial courts. Jackson has previously filed one appeal and two mandamus actions in this Court, along with numerous other documents.¹ *See Jackson v.*

¹ In the direct appeal in Cause No. 08-19-00260-CV, Jackson, who identifies himself as an “Officer of the United States” and “Sovereign King of all the Lands,” filed a total of sixteen documents in addition to a document he filed as his Appellant’s Brief. Some of these documents include:

- An “original petition for declaratory judgement” on August 10, 2020, seeking a \$7 million judgment against Travis County/the State of Texas;

Cave, No. 08-19-00260-CV (Tex.App.--El Paso Jan. 8, 2021, no pet.)(op. not available on Westlaw)(appeal from an order denying a bill of review heard on transfer from the Third Court of Appeals under the Texas Supreme Court’s docket equalization order)(*Jackson III*); *In re Jackson*, No. 08-20-00241-CV, 2020 WL 7137294, at *1 (Tex.App.--El Paso Dec. 7, 2020, orig. proceeding)(mandamus denied)(*Jackson II*); *In re Jackson*, No. 08-20-00026-CV, 2020 WL 562983, at *2 (Tex.App.--El Paso Feb. 5, 2020, orig. proceeding)(mandamus attacking trial court’s alleged failure to rule on a motion to strike testimony dismissed for want of jurisdiction)(*Jackson I*).

On January 8, 2021, this Court concluded in *Jackson III* that the Travis County Court at Law No. 2 lacked jurisdiction over Jackson’s bill of review in Cause No. C-1-CV-19-004699 because Jackson was required to file his action for a bill of review with the trial court that originally issued the order he sought to attack (in this case, Travis County Court at Law No. 4). Consequently, because Jackson filed his bill of review action with the wrong court, Travis County Court at Law No. 2 lacked jurisdiction over the bill of review action, and we, in turn, lacked appellate jurisdiction over an appeal from that void action. *See Jackson III*, No. 08-19-00260-CV (Tex.App.--El Paso Jan. 8, 2021, no pet.)(not available on Westlaw).

Jackson’s two previous mandamus applications were rejected. This third mandamus application will be rejected as well. As we explained previously, this Court does not have the authority to issue writs of mandamus against a trial court in Travis County—which lies outside this Court’s geographic district—unless that trial court’s actions threaten this Court’s jurisdiction

-
- A purported “writ of execution” that references the Impeachment Clause of the United States Constitution, received on October 21, 2020;
 - A document entitled “presidential impeachment” on December 15, 2020;
 - A purported “writ of quo warranto” on December 18, 2020.

over an ongoing appellate matter, such as an appeal that has been transferred to this Court under a Texas Supreme Court docket equalization order. *See In re Jackson I*, 2020 WL 562983, at *1-*2. We further determined that we lacked jurisdiction to issue a writ of mandamus against a county court in Travis County outside our geographic district because the trial court’s action did not impair our ability to process the appeal transferred to us from the Third Court of Appeals in Cause No. 08-19-00260-CV. *See id.*

That holding is doubly true now that our involvement with the appeal in *Jackson III* has essentially concluded. This Court has already issued an opinion and judgment in Cause No. 08-19-00260-CV on January 8, 2021. Court records indicate that Jackson did not file a timely motion for rehearing in that appeal.² While the Court retains plenary power over the judgment in Cause No. 08-19-00260-CV for sixty days under the circumstances, *see* TEX.R.APP.P. 19.1(a), as a practical matter, this Court’s involvement with that appeal has concluded.³ *See* TEX.R.APP.P. 49.1

² Jackson did file a miscellaneous document entitled “Supplimentary [sic] Proceeding for Bill of Review” after the Court issued its judgment in which Jackson stated that he was “Delegated a portion of the United States Sovereignty and a portion of the United States Legislative power.” Attached to the document is another document signed by Jackson in which he, as purported “Soverign King of all the Lands” and “Guardian of the Disenfranchised,” attempts to award himself the vacation of the 50-year protective order, an expunction as to a criminal charge of aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, and “the approximate amount of \$7 Million Dollars[.]”

The Court received this document in lieu of filing it as a motion for rehearing. Under even the liberal briefing standards set by the Rules of Appellate Procedure, the filing was not clear or cogent enough to constitute a sufficient motion for rehearing, and the body of the document did not ask the Court to reconsider its ruling. *See* TEX.R.APP.P. 49.1 (a motion for rehearing “must clearly state the points relied on for the rehearing”); *Tex. Mex. Ry. Co. v. Bouchet*, 963 S.W.2d 52, 54 (Tex. 1998)(a point of error for rehearing must direct the attention of the appellate court to the error about which complaint is made to be sufficient to assign matter for appellate court’s review). As such, Jackson did not file an effective motion for rehearing in Cause No. 08-19-00260-CV.

³ WE PLACE JACKSON AND ALL PARTIES ON NOTICE THAT BECAUSE THE TIME PERIOD FOR FILING A MOTION FOR REHEARING IN CAUSE NO. 08-19-00260-CV HAS EXPIRED, ANY FURTHER FILINGS MADE IN CAUSE NO. 08-19-00260-CV ARE SUBJECT TO POTENTIAL REJECTION WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE.

WE FURTHER ORDER THAT A COPY OF THIS OPINION MEMORIALIZING THIS NOTICE TO JACKSON AND ALL PARTIES REGARDING FUTURE FILINGS BE PLACED IN THE CASE FILE FOR CAUSE NO. 08-19-00260-CV.

(motion for rehearing must be filed within 15 days after court of appeals' judgment is entered). Consequently, because the judgment in *Jackson III* has already issued, the trial court's actions do not pose a threat to our jurisdiction over Cause No. 08-19-00260-CV, and we otherwise lack the authority to issue a writ of mandamus to the trial court outside our geographic district. *See In re Jackson*, 2020 WL 562983, at *1-*2.

As such, Jackson's petition for a writ of mandamus is hereby dismissed for want of jurisdiction. The proper venue for filing a writ of mandamus challenging court proceedings in Travis County is the Third Court of Appeals in Austin. *See* TEX.GOV'T CODE ANN. § 22.201(d)(naming Travis County as being within the jurisdiction of the Third Court of Appeals).

YVONNE T. RODRIGUEZ, Chief Justice

February 25, 2021

Before Rodriguez, C.J., Palafox, and Alley, JJ.