



**COURT OF APPEALS
SECOND DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH**

NO. 02-12-00311-CV

CORNELIUS HUDSON

APPELLANT

V.

MAJOR JOE E. AND SHIRLEY
BRYANT

APPELLEES

FROM COUNTY COURT AT LAW NO. 1 OF TARRANT COUNTY

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

Cornelius Hudson, pro se, attempts to appeal from a contempt judgment. On August 22, 2012, we notified Hudson of our concern that we might not have jurisdiction over this appeal because contempt judgments generally are not appealable. See *Ex parte Williams*, 690 S.W.2d 243, 243 n.1 (Tex. 1985) (orig. proceeding); *In re Office of Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 215 S.W.3d 913, 916 (Tex.

¹See Tex. R. App. P. 47.4.

App.—Fort Worth 2007, orig. proceeding) (“A contempt judgment may be attacked by a petition for writ of habeas corpus (if the contemnor is confined) or a petition for writ of mandamus (if no confinement is involved) . . .; however, because a contempt order is not a final judgment, a remedy by appeal does not lie.”) (citation omitted). We stated that unless Hudson or any party desiring to continue this appeal filed a response showing grounds for continuing the appeal on or before September 4, 2012, this appeal could be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a). Hudson filed a response, but it does not show grounds for continuing this appeal.

Because the contempt judgment at issue is not a final judgment, nor is it an appealable interlocutory order, we dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 43.2(f).

PER CURIAM

PANEL: WALKER, MCCOY, and MEIER, JJ.

DELIVERED: September 27, 2012