



**In The  
Court of Appeals  
Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo**

---

No. 07-14-00210-CV

---

**IN RE WILLIAM WALTER YOUNGSTROM, RELATOR**

---

---

Original Proceeding Arising from the 355th District Court  
Hood County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 12355; Honorable Ralph H. Walton, Jr., Presiding

---

---

June 16, 2014

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before **CAMPBELL** and **HANCOCK** and **PIRTLE, JJ.**

Relator, William Walter Youngstrom, proceeding *pro se*, files this mandamus proceeding complaining of Matthew A. Mills, his court-appointed appellate attorney in *Youngstrom v. State*, Cause Number 07-13-00385-CR. He alleges Mills refused to raise certain issues in his direct appeal which denied him effective assistance of counsel.<sup>1</sup> We dismiss this proceeding for want of jurisdiction.

---

<sup>1</sup> This Court delivered its opinion and judgment affirming Relator's conviction for delivery of a controlled substance on June 9, 2014. See *Youngstrom v. State*, No. 07-13-00385-CR, 2014 Tex. App. LEXIS 6215, at \*1 (Tex. App.—Amarillo June 9, 2014, no pet. h.).

This Court has the authority to issue a writ of mandamus necessary to enforce our jurisdiction, consistent with the principles of law regulating such a writ, against a judge of a district or county court in our district. TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 22.221(a), (b) (West 2004). An attorney representing an appellant on direct appeal is not within our jurisdictional reach. Furthermore, Relator has not demonstrated that issuance of a writ of mandamus is necessary to enforce our jurisdiction. *In re Coronado*, 980 S.W.2d 691, 692-93 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1998, no pet.). Consequently, we have no authority to issue a writ of mandamus against Matthew A. Mills.

Accordingly, the petition for writ of mandamus is dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Patrick A. Pirtle  
Justice