



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

---

No. 07-17-00352-CV

---

IN RE CASEY LEON RIDDLEY, RELATOR

---

OPINION ON ORIGINAL PROCEEDING FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

---

October 5, 2017

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before QUINN, C.J., and CAMPBELL and PARKER, JJ.

Relator, Casey Leon Riddley, filed various motions with this court involving his apparent criminal prosecution filed with the 64th Judicial District Court, Hale County, Texas. Acting pro se, he asks that we (1) review evidence apparently “being incorporated into [his] case” per an order or decision of the court, (2) order the trial court to “restore original bond of \$25,000 and remove the cash bond of \$25,000,” (3) grant a motion for continuance, and (4) remove his appointed attorney. We construe the document as an attempt to petition for a writ of mandamus, and in so reading it, we deny it.

No appendix accompanied his petition. Thus, we do not have either sworn or certified copies of any orders pertaining to his evidentiary complaints or the bond.

Same were required under Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 52.3(k)(1)(a). Nor does the petition contain a clear and concise argument supporting the contentions made with appropriate citation to legal authorities, as required by Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 52.3(h). Indeed, citation to authority indicating that we may grant motions to continue trial court criminal proceedings or to remove appointed counsel without the movant first seeking such relief from the trial court would be helpful. And, though relator may be acting pro se, he is not excused from complying with the applicable rules of procedure. See *In re Johnson*, No. 07-15-00280-CV, 2015 Tex. App. LEXIS 8217, at \*2 (Tex. App.—Amarillo Aug. 5, 2015, orig. proceeding) (mem. op).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for mandamus.

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice