



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

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

No. 04-18-00948-CV

**IN RE Jason Charles CARTER**

Original Mandamus Proceeding<sup>1</sup>

PER CURIAM

Sitting: Sandee Bryan Marion, Chief Justice  
Luz Elena D. Chapa, Justice  
Irene Rios, Justice

Delivered and Filed: December 19, 2018

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS DENIED

Relator filed a petition for writ of mandamus complaining the trial court has refused to rule on any of his motions. Because relator has not provided this court with a sufficient record, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus.

**DISCUSSION**

To establish a right to mandamus relief in a criminal case, the relator must show the trial court violated a ministerial duty and there is no adequate remedy at law. *In re State ex rel. Weeks*, 391 S.W.3d 117, 122 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013) (orig. proceeding). A trial court has a ministerial duty to rule on a properly-filed and timely-presented motion. *See In re State ex rel. Young v. Sixth Judicial Dist. Court of Appeals*, 236 S.W.3d 207, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007) (orig. proceeding).

---

<sup>1</sup> This proceeding arises out of Cause No. 17316-A, styled *The State of Texas v. Jason Charles Carter*, pending in the 216th Judicial District Court, Kerr County, Texas, the Honorable N. Keith Williams presiding.

However, a relator has the burden of providing this court with a record sufficient to establish his right to mandamus relief. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 52.7(a)(1) (requiring relator to file “a certified or sworn copy of every document that is material to the relator’s claim for relief and that was filed in any underlying proceeding”). In a case such as this one, a relator has the burden to provide the court of appeals with a record showing the motion at issue was properly filed, the trial court was made aware of the motion, and the motion has not been ruled on by the trial court for an unreasonable period of time. *See In re Mendoza*, 131 S.W.3d 167, 167-68 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2004, orig. proceeding).

Here, relator has not provided this court with file-stamped copies of his motions or any proof indicating the trial court is aware of the motions. Also, relator has not provided a record establishing his motions have awaited disposition for an unreasonable period of time. *Id.* Because relator did not provide this court with a sufficient record, relator has not shown himself entitled to mandamus relief. Accordingly, the petition for writ of mandamus is denied.

PER CURIAM