



Fourth Court of Appeals
San Antonio, Texas

MEMORANDUM OPINION

No. 04-19-00854-CR

IN RE Jemadari Chinua WILLIAMS

Original Mandamus Proceeding¹

PER CURIAM

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

Delivered and Filed: December 18, 2019

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS DENIED

Relator filed a “Petition for Leave,” however, he does not state the specific relief requested. To the extent relator requests leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus, we deny as moot his request because leave is not required to file a petition for writ of mandamus in an intermediate appellate court. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 52.1; *In re Medina*, 04-19-00041-CR, 2019 WL 360534, at *1 (Tex. App.—San Antonio Jan. 30, 2019, no pet.). To the extent relator requests leave to file a pro se petition despite being represented by trial counsel, we deny this request because relator has not demonstrated the interests of justice require us to do so in this case. *See Williams v. State*, 946 S.W.2d 886, 892 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.) (“we may consider a pro se brief if the interests of justice require us to do so”).

¹ This proceeding arises out of Cause No. B19346, styled *The State of Texas v. Jemadari Chinua Williams*, pending in the 198th Judicial District Court, Kerr County, Texas, the Honorable M. Rex Emerson presiding.

Relator's petition for writ of mandamus complains of the trial court's refusal to rule on his pro se motions and the district clerk's refusal to file his pro se motions. Relator is represented by trial counsel below; therefore, he is not entitled to hybrid representation. *Patrick v. State*, 906 S.W.2d 481, 498 (Tex. Crim. App. 1995). The absence of a right to hybrid representation means relator's pro se mandamus petition will be treated as presenting nothing for this court's review. *See id.* Accordingly, relator's petition for writ of mandamus is denied. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 52.8(a).

PER CURIAM

Do not publish