



NUMBER 13-22-00130-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

IN RE MARCUS DOWNIE

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Justices Longoria, Hinojosa, and Silva
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Hinojosa¹**

Marcus Downie has filed a pro se petition for writ of mandamus raising contentions of judicial misconduct, ineffective assistance of counsel, and due process violations. Although his allegations are difficult to discern, Downie appears to seek the dismissal of all criminal charges pending against him.

In a criminal case, to be entitled to mandamus relief, the relator must establish both that the act sought to be compelled is a ministerial act not involving a discretionary

¹ 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. When granting relief, the court must hand down an opinion as in any other case.”); *id.* R. 47.4 (distinguishing opinions and memorandum opinions).

or judicial decision and that there is no adequate remedy at law to redress the alleged harm. See *In re Meza*, 611 S.W.3d 383, 388 (Tex. Crim. App. 2020) (orig. proceeding); *In re Harris*, 491 S.W.3d 332, 334 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016) (orig. proceeding) (per curiam); *In re McCann*, 422 S.W.3d 701, 704 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013) (orig. proceeding). If the relator fails to meet both requirements, then the petition for writ of mandamus should be denied. *State ex rel. Young v. Sixth Jud. Dist. Ct. of Apps. at Texarkana*, 236 S.W.3d 207, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007) (orig. proceeding).

It is the relator's burden to properly request and show entitlement to mandamus relief. See *State ex rel. Young*, 236 S.W.3d at 210; *In re Pena*, 619 S.W.3d 837, 839 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2021, orig. proceeding); see also *Barnes v. State*, 832 S.W.2d 424, 426 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1992, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (“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, the relator must include a statement of facts and 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 (governing the form and contents for a petition). Further, the relator must file an appendix and 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 relief. Therefore, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus. See TEX. R. APP. P. 52.8.

LETICIA HINOJOSA
Justice

Do not publish.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

Delivered and filed on the
31st day of March, 2022.