

**NO. 12-09-00003-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

§

***IN RE: MICHAEL KENNEDY,  
RELATOR***

§ ***ORIGINAL PROCEEDING***

§

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION  
PER CURIAM***

Michael Kennedy filed a pro se petition for mandamus relief asking us to direct the trial court to rule on his motion to dismiss his appellate counsel.

Before mandamus relief may issue to require a trial court to rule on a motion, the relator must establish that the court was asked to rule and failed or refused to do so within a reasonable time. *See Safety-Kleen Corp. v. Garcia*, 945 S.W.2d 268, 269 (Tex. App.–San Antonio 1997, orig. proceeding). The record in this case does not include any correspondence or other document in which Kennedy calls the trial court's attention to the motion or requests that a hearing be set to determine its merit. The trial court cannot be faulted for doing nothing when it was not aware of the need to act. *In re Villareal*, 96 S.W.3d 708, 710 (Tex. App.–Amarillo 2003, orig. proceeding). We cannot simply assume that the trial court knew of its duty to act and neglected to perform it. *Id.* Accordingly, Kennedy's petition for writ of mandamus is *denied*.

Opinion delivered January 7, 2009.

*Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.*

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



**COURT OF APPEALS**  
**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS**  
**JUDGMENT**

**JANUARY 7, 2009**

**NO. 12-09-00003-CR**

**IN RE: MICHAEL KENNEDY,**  
**RELATOR**

---

---

**ORIGINAL PROCEEDING**

---

---

ON THIS DAY came to be heard the petition for writ of mandamus filed by **MICHAEL KENNEDY**, who is the relator in Cause No. 29326, pending on the docket of the 3rd Judicial District Court of Anderson County, Texas. Said petition for writ of mandamus having been filed herein on January 5, 2009, and the same having been duly considered, because it is the opinion of this Court that **A WRIT OF MANDAMUS SHOULD NOT ISSUE**, it is therefore **CONSIDERED, ADJUDGED** and **ORDERED** that the said petition for writ of mandamus be, and the same is, hereby **DENIED**.

*By per curiam opinion.*

*Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.*