



NUMBER 13-17-00542-CV

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI - EDINBURG

---

---

RAYMOND TRENT PETEREK,

Appellant,

v.

MELISSA JEAN ALLISON,

Appellee.

---

---

On appeal from the County Court at Law  
of Aransas County, Texas.

---

---

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Chief Justice Valdez and Justices Contreras and Hinojosa  
Memorandum Opinion by Chief Justice Valdez**

Appellant, Raymond Trent Peterek, attempted to perfect an appeal from an order denying his request for a teleconference signed on August 22, 2017, in cause no. A-15-7029-FL. This Court previously issued a memorandum opinion and judgment on May 19, 2016, regarding this trial court cause number in cause number 13-16-00133-CV.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This Court dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction because appellant failed to timely perfect his appeal from a final decree of divorce. See TEX. R. APP. P. 26.1.

Upon review of the documents before the Court, it appeared that there was no final, appealable judgment dated August 22, 2017. On October 6, 2017, the Clerk of this Court notified appellant of this defect so that steps could be taken to correct the defect, if it could be done. See TEX. R. APP. P. 37.1, 42.3. Appellant was advised that, if the defect was not corrected within ten days from the date of receipt of the notice, the appeal would be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Appellant responded to the Court's notice and advised that we should have received the notice of appeal pertaining to a final order concerning his motion for teleconference hearing.

In terms of appellate jurisdiction, appellate courts only have jurisdiction to review final judgments and certain interlocutory orders identified by statute. *Lehmann v. Har-Con Corp.*, 39 S.W.3d 191, 195 (Tex. 2001). An appeal of an order denying a request for a teleconference is not authorized by statute. See *Id.*

The Court, having considered the documents on file and appellant's failure to correct the defect in this matter, is of the opinion that the appeal should be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Accordingly, the appeal is DISMISSED FOR WANT OF JURISDICTION. See TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a),(c). All pending motions are likewise dismissed.

**/s/ Rogelio Valdez**  
ROGELIO VALDEZ  
Chief Justice

Delivered and filed the  
2nd day of November, 2017.