

DISMISS; and Opinion Filed October 1, 2013.



**In The
Court of Appeals
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

No. 05-13-01099-CV

THERESA BARNETT, Appellant

V.

DAVID S. CROCKETT, ET AL., Appellees

**On Appeal from the 116th Judicial District Court
Dallas County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 10-00136-F**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Justices O'Neill, Lang-Miers, and Evans
Opinion Per Curiam

The Court has before it appellees' August 28, 2013 motion to dismiss and appellant's September 6, 2013 response to that motion. On September 9, 2013, this Court denied appellant's motion for damages and invited appellant to file an additional response to the motion to dismiss. Appellant filed three additional responses, but did not respond to appellees' argument that appellant is attempting to appeal an interlocutory sanctions order. This Court does not have jurisdiction over such an order. *See Petitto v. Energytec, Inc.*, No. 05-09-00140-CV, 2009 WL 1286330 at *1 (Tex. App.—Dallas May 11, 2009, no pet.). Accordingly, we **DISMISS** this appeal for want of jurisdiction.

PER CURIAM



**Court of Appeals
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

JUDGMENT

THERESA BARNETT, Appellant

No. 05-13-01099-CV V.

DAVID S. CROCKETT, ET AL., Appellees

On Appeal from the 116th Judicial District
Court, Dallas County, Texas

Trial Court Cause No. 10-00136-F.

Opinion delivered Per Curiam. Justices
O'Neill, Lang-Miers and Evans sitting for
the Court.

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, this appeal is **DISMISSED** for want of jurisdiction.

It is **ORDERED** that appellees DAVID S. CROCKETT, ET AL. recover their costs of this appeal from appellant THERESA BARNETT.

Judgment entered this 1st day of October, 2013.

/Michael J. O'Neill/

MICHAEL J. O'NEILL

JUSTICE