



**NUMBER 13-11-00764-CR**

**COURT OF APPEALS**

**THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**CORPUS CHRISTI - EDINBURG**

---

---

**IN RE GREGORY S. FORBES**

---

---

**On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**Before Chief Justice Valdez and Justices Garza and Vela  
Memorandum Opinion Per Curiam<sup>1</sup>**

Relator, Gregory Forbes, proceeding pro se, filed a petition for writ of mandamus on December 7, 2011, through which he seeks to compel the trial court to rule on a motion for nunc pro tunc judgment.<sup>2</sup>

To be entitled to mandamus relief, relator must establish both that he has no adequate remedy at law to redress his alleged harm, and that what he seeks to compel

---

<sup>1</sup> See TEX. R. APP. P. 52.8(d) ("When denying relief, the court may hand down an opinion but is not required to do so."); TEX. R. APP. P. 47.4 (distinguishing opinions and memorandum opinions).

<sup>2</sup> The Court has previously considered and denied a petition for writ of mandamus filed by relator on this same exact issue. See *In re Forbes*, No. 13-11-00741-CR, 2011 Tex. App. LEXIS 9436, at \*\*1–2 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi Nov. 28, 2011, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op. not designated for publication).

is a ministerial act not involving a discretionary or judicial decision. *State ex rel. Young v. Sixth Judicial Dist. Court of Appeals at Texarkana*, 236 S.W.3d 207, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007). If relator fails to meet both of these requirements, then the petition for writ of mandamus should be denied. See *id.* It is relator's burden to properly request and show entitlement to mandamus relief. *Barnes v. State*, 832 S.W.2d 424, 426 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1992, orig. proceeding) (“Even a pro se applicant for a writ of mandamus must show himself entitled to the extraordinary relief he seeks.”). In addition to other requirements, relator must include a statement of facts supported by citations to “competent evidence included in the appendix or record,” and must also provide “a clear and concise argument for the contentions made, with appropriate citations to authorities and to the appendix or record.” See generally TEX. R. APP. P. 52.3. In this regard, it is clear that relator must furnish an appendix or record sufficient to support the claim for mandamus relief. See *id.* R. 52.3(k) (specifying the required contents for the appendix); R. 52.7(a) (specifying the required contents for the record).

The Court, having examined and fully considered the petition for writ of mandamus and the applicable law, is of the opinion that relator has not met his burden to obtain mandamus relief. See *State ex rel. Young*, 236 S.W.3d at 210. Accordingly, relator's petition for writ of mandamus is denied. See TEX. R. APP. P. 52.8(a).

PER CURIAM

Do not publish. TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b).

Delivered and filed the  
22nd day of December, 2011.