

Opinion issued July 12, 2016



In The  
**Court of Appeals**  
For The  
**First District of Texas**

---

NO. 01-15-00971-CV

---

**KING FUELS, INC., Appellant**

**V.**

**SYED R. ENTERPRISES, INC., SYED AZEEMUDDIN AND AYESHA  
TABASSUM, Appellees**

---

**On Appeal from County Civil Court at Law No. 2  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Case No. 1062261**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

King Fuels, Inc. appeals from the trial court's grant of a motion to transfer venue.

Appeals may be taken from final judgments. *Lehmann v. Har-Con Corp.*, 39 S.W.3d 191, 195 (Tex. 2001). Interlocutory orders can be appealed only when

expressly authorized by statute. *Bally Total Fitness Corp. v. Jackson*, 53 S.W.3d 352, 352 (Tex. 2001). Here, the record reveals that no final judgment has been entered. The trial court's grant of King Fuel's motion to transfer venue does not dispose of King Fuel's claims. Accordingly, the order transferring venue is interlocutory.

On June 14, 2016, the Court notified the parties of its intent to dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction unless appellant filed a response demonstrating this court's jurisdiction on or before June 24, 2016. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a).

King Fuels filed a response, arguing the trial court's ruling was reviewable by mandamus. *See* TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE ANN. § 15.0642 (Vernon 2002). This does not establish a right to an interlocutory appeal.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a), 43.2(f).

### **PER CURIAM**

Panel consists of Justices Higley, Bland, and Massengale.

---

<sup>1</sup> King Fuels has also filed a petition for writ of mandamus under a separate cause number. We have reviewed and ruled on that cause.