

**NO. 12-16-00079-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

***IN RE:***

§

***JOHN H. HARTSFIELD,***

§

***ORIGINAL PROCEEDING***

***RELATOR***

§

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION  
PER CURIAM***

John Hartsfield requests a writ of mandamus compelling the Judge of the 241st Judicial District Court of Smith County to provide him a “free loaners copy” of the record in his criminal case (trial court cause number 241-2332-07). He alleges that he filed a motion for a “free loaner’s copy” of “trial transcripts reporter’s and appellate recorder’s,” but the trial court did not respond to the motion.

Hartsfield’s mandamus petition is not accompanied by a record that includes certified or sworn copies of “every document that is material to the relator’s claim for relief.” *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 52.7(a)(1). Therefore, we cannot determine whether Hartsfield has a right to the relief he requests. *See State ex rel. Young v. Sixth Judicial Dist. Court of Appeals at Texarkana*, 236 S.W.3d 207, 210 (Tex. Crim. App. 2007) (orig. proceeding) (holding that relator seeking mandamus relief must show no adequate remedy at law and that what he seeks to compel is a ministerial act, not involving discretionary or judicial decision). Accordingly, we ***deny*** Hartsfield’s petition for writ of mandamus.

Opinion delivered March 23, 2016.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



## COURT OF APPEALS

### TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

#### JUDGMENT

MARCH 23, 2016

NO. 12-16-00079-CR

**JOHN H. HARTSFIELD,**

Relator

v.

**HON. JACK SKEEN, JR.,**

Respondent

---

---

#### ORIGINAL PROCEEDING

---

---

ON THIS DAY came to be heard the petition for writ of mandamus filed by **JOHN H. HARTSFIELD**, who is the relator in Cause No. 241-2332-07, pending on the docket of the 241st Judicial District Court of Smith County, Texas. Said petition for writ of mandamus having been filed herein on March 23, 2016, 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., Hoyle, J. and Neeley, J.*