

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-17-00277-CV

IN RE COMMITMENT OF CURTIS ALLEN ARNOLD

On Appeal from the 435th District Court
Montgomery County, Texas
Trial Cause No. 15-05-05169-CV

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Curtis Allen Arnold was determined to be a sexually violent predator and committed for sex offender treatment in 2015. *See In re Commitment of Arnold*, No. 09-15-00499-CV, 2016 WL 4483181, at *1 (Tex. App.—Beaumont Aug. 25, 2016, pet. denied) (mem. op.). On June 19, 2017, the trial court signed an order denying Arnold’s motion for change of venue. Arnold filed a notice of appeal. We questioned our jurisdiction and the parties filed responses.

Generally, appeals may be taken only from final judgments. *Lehmann v. Har-Con Corp.*, 39 S.W.3d 191, 195 (Tex. 2001). Arnold argues the order denying his

motion for a change of venue disposed of all pending claims and parties. In a civil commitment case, however, the trial court retains jurisdiction while the commitment order remains in effect. *See In re Commitment of Cortez*, 405 S.W.3d 929, 932 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2013, no pet.). Arnold has not identified a signed order by the trial court that is appealable at this time.¹ Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a); 43.2(f).

APPEAL DISMISSED.

STEVE McKEITHEN
Chief Justice

Submitted on August 16, 2017
Opinion Delivered August 17, 2017

Before McKeithen, C.J., Kreger and Horton, JJ.

¹Arnold requests that we consider his response as a mandamus petition, but neither the form nor the substance of the response presents a valid basis for granting mandamus relief. *See generally* Tex. R. App. P. 52. Accordingly, the request is denied.