

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-12-00451-CV

IN RE COMMITMENT OF JACK KIRSCH

On Appeal from the 435th District Court
Montgomery County, Texas
Trial Cause No. 07-05-04726 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 Jack Kirsch 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 Kirsch 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 Kirsch 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 Kirsch has not demonstrated that he should receive mandamus relief. Accordingly, we dismiss Kirsch’s appeal.

APPEAL DISMISSED.

HOLLIS HORTON
Justice

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