



**Fourth Court of Appeals**  
**San Antonio, Texas**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

No. 04-13-00655-CV

**IN RE** Sonia **REYNA**

Original Mandamus Proceeding<sup>1</sup>

PER CURIAM

Sitting: Karen Angelini, Justice  
Rebeca C. Martinez, Justice  
Patricia O. Alvarez, Justice

Delivered and Filed: October 9, 2013

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS DISMISSED FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION**

On September 30, 2013, relator Sonia Reyna<sup>2</sup> filed a petition for writ of mandamus complaining of the associate judge's order granting temporary managing conservatorship of relator's children to the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. By statute, this court may only issue a writ of mandamus against a "judge of a district or county court in the court of appeals district" and other writs as necessary to enforce our appellate jurisdiction. *See* TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 22.221(a)-(b) (West 2004). Although a copy of the order complained of was not provided with the petition, relator asserts the order was signed by the associate judge. We do not have jurisdiction to issue a writ of mandamus against an associate judge. *In re Texas Dep't of*

---

<sup>1</sup> This proceeding arises out of Cause No. 2013PA01789, styled *In the Interest of J.L., et al., Children*, pending in the 166th Judicial District Court, Bexar County, Texas, the Honorable Associate Judge Charles E. Montemayor presiding.

<sup>2</sup> Relator styled her petition, "*In the Interest of J.P., et al., Children.*" The petition, however, is not brought on behalf of the minor children. In a petition for writ of mandamus, the party seeking relief is the relator. TEX. R. APP. P. 52.2. The proper style, therefore, is *In re Sonia Reyna*.

*Family and Protective Servs.*, 348 S.W.3d 492, 495 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2011, orig. proceeding). Accordingly, we dismiss relator’s petition for writ of mandamus for lack of jurisdiction.

PER CURIAM