



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

NO. 02-16-00283-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF A.T., A
CHILD

FROM THE 43RD DISTRICT COURT OF PARKER COUNTY
TRIAL COURT NO. CV13-1349

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

Appellant C.T. attempts to appeal from an order holding her in contempt and suspending commitment. On September 26, 2016, we notified C.T. of our concern that we may not have jurisdiction over this appeal because the contempt order is not appealable. See *In re Office of Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 215 S.W.3d 913, 915 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2007, orig. proceeding). We informed C.T. that this appeal may be dismissed for want of jurisdiction unless she or any party desiring to continue the appeal filed a response with the court by October 6,

¹See Tex. R. App. P. 47.4.

2016, showing grounds for continuing the appeal. See Tex. R. App. P. 44.3. Although we received a response to a previous jurisdiction letter that we had sent, we have not received a response to the September 26, 2016 inquiry.

“Decisions in contempt proceedings cannot be reviewed on appeal because contempt orders are not appealable, even when appealed along with a judgment that is appealable.” *Office of Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 215 S.W.3d at 915 (quoting *Cadle Co. v. Lobingier*, 50 S.W.3d 662, 671 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2001, pet. denied) (en banc op. on reh’g); see *Tex. Animal Health Comm’n v. Nunley*, 647 S.W.2d 951, 952 (Tex. 1983). Contempt orders involving confinement may be reviewed by writ of habeas corpus; contempt orders that do not involve confinement may be reviewed only through mandamus. *Office of Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 215 S.W.3d at 916; see *Tracy v. Tracy*, 219 S.W.3d 527, 530 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2007, no pet.).

Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 43.2(f).

PER CURIAM

PANEL: MEIER, GABRIEL, and SUDDERTH, JJ.

DELIVERED: December 1, 2016