

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

---

**NO. 09-17-00330-CV**

---

**IN RE COMMITMENT OF CURTIS ADAMS**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 435th District Court**  
**Montgomery County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause No. 01-10-06658-CV**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Curtis Adams filed a notice of appeal from an order denying a motion for a change of venue. 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). Adams 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.). Adams has not identified a signed order by the trial court that is appealable at this time.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a); 43.2(f).

APPEAL DISMISSED.

---

HOLLIS HORTON  
Justice

Submitted on October 4, 2017  
Opinion Delivered October 5, 2017

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

---

<sup>1</sup>Adams 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.