

Deny and Opinion Filed April 22, 2014.



In The
Court of Appeals
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas

No. 05-14-00457-CV

IN RE HARTFORD LIFE AND ANNUITY INSURANCE COMPANY, Relator

Original Proceeding from the 298th Judicial District Court
Dallas County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. DC 12 02312-M

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Justices Moseley, Fillmore, and Lewis
Opinion by Justice Moseley

The Court has before it Relator's petition for writ of mandamus. Relator's petition does not satisfy the requirements of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. The petition is not properly certified. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 52.3(j); *In re Butler*, 270 S.W.3d 757, 758 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2008, orig. proceeding). The appendix is also incomplete. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 52.3(k); TEX. R. APP. P. 52.7(a); *In re Le*, 335 S.W.3d 808, 813 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2011, no pet.) (“Those seeking the extraordinary remedy of mandamus must follow the applicable procedural rules. Chief among these is the critical obligation to provide the reviewing court with a complete and adequate record.”).

Additionally, only members of the state bar of Texas and persons licensed by the Texas Supreme Court may practice law in Texas. TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 81.102(a), (b) (West 2013); *Rabb Int'l, Inc. v. SHL Thai Food Serv., LLC*, 346 S.W.3d 208, 210–11 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2011, no pet.). Although the petition for writ of mandamus is signed by a member

of the Texas Bar, the signature block also includes two lawyers who are not members of the Texas Bar. Although they represent that they have been admitted to practice *pro hac vice*, they have not moved for, and we have not granted, admission *pro hac vice* in this mandamus proceeding. A trial court's grant of a motion for admission for *pro hac vice* status does not apply to an original proceeding in this Court. TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 82.0361 (West 2013); *see Moreno v. State*, 246 S.W.3d 380, 380 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2008, no pet.) (per curiam).

On the record before the Court, Relator has not shown it is entitled to relief. TEX. R. APP. P. 52.8 (a). Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the petition for writ of mandamus.

/Jim Moseley/

JIM MOSELEY
JUSTICE

140457F.P05