

**In The**  
***Court of Appeals***  
***Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont***

---

**NO. 09-12-00412-CV**

---

**IN RE COMMITMENT OF RICHARD HAUBOIS**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 435th District Court**  
**Montgomery County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause No. 07-09-08953 CV**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

In an appeal from an order entered in a sexually-violent-predator proceeding, we are asked to address whether we possess appellate jurisdiction over an order changing the entity that approves where Richard Haubois is required to reside. We conclude that the trial court's order is not appealable, and we also conclude that mandamus relief on the issues Haubois raises is not warranted. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

Recently, in *In re Commitment of Holt* and *In re Commitment of Cortez*, we addressed the same issues Haubois raises in his brief, and we concluded that we

did not have appellate jurisdiction over these same issues. *In re Commitment of Holt*, No. 09-12-00406-CV, 2013 WL \_\_\_\_\_, at \*\_\_ (Tex. App.—Beaumont July 11, 2013, no pet. h.); *In re Commitment of Cortez*, No. 09-12-00385-CV, 2013 WL 3270613, at \*2 (Tex. App.—Beaumont June 27, 2013, no pet. h.). We also considered whether Holt and Cortez raised issues entitling them to mandamus relief. *See Holt*, 2013 WL \_\_\_\_\_, at \*\_\_; *Cortez*, 2013 WL 3270613, at \*\*2-6.

For the same reasons stated in *Holt* and *Cortez*, we conclude that we lack appellate jurisdiction to review the trial court’s order dated July 26, 2012, and that Haubois has not demonstrated that he should receive mandamus relief. Accordingly, we dismiss Haubois’s appeal.

APPEAL DISMISSED.

---

HOLLIS HORTON  
Justice

Submitted on July 10, 2013  
Opinion Delivered August 15, 2013  
Before Gaultney, Kreger, and Horton, JJ.