

NO. 12-17-00145-CR
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT
TYLER, TEXAS

IN RE: §
MICHAEL A. KENNEDY, § *ORIGINAL PROCEEDING*
RELATOR §

MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM

Relator, Michael A. Kennedy, filed this original proceeding, in which he asserts violations of due process and professional conduct provisions by “judges.” We deny the petition.

A petition for writ of mandamus “must contain a clear and concise argument for the contentions made, with appropriate citations to authorities and to the appendix or record.” TEX. R. APP. P. 52.3(h). Fulfilling this duty entails more than proffering mere conclusions. *In re Fitzgerald*, 429 S.W.3d 886, 897 (Tex. App.—Tyler 2014, orig. proceeding). Instead, the relator must provide substantive legal analysis as well as citations to authority supporting his legal arguments and conclusions. *Id.* In this case, Relator’s arguments consist of mere conclusions without any discussion of applicable legal principles or controlling authority. Consequently, he has failed to provide the “clear and concise argument” and “appropriate citations to authorities” required by Rule 52.3(h). For this reason, we are unable to conclude that Relator is entitled to mandamus relief. See *In re Kennedy*, No 12-12-00043-CR, 2012 WL 1884264, at *1 (Tex. App.—Tyler May 23, 2012, orig. proceeding) (mem. op., not designated for publication). Accordingly, we *deny* Relator’s petition for writ of mandamus.

Opinion delivered May 24, 2017.

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(DO NOT PUBLISH)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

MAY 24, 2017

NO. 12-17-00145-CR

MICHAEL A. KENNEDY,
Relator
V.

HON. MARK A. CALHOON,
Respondent

ORIGINAL PROCEEDING

ON THIS DAY came to be heard the petition for writ of mandamus filed by Michael A. Kennedy; who is the relator in Cause No. 29326. Said petition for writ of mandamus having been filed herein on May 12, 2017, and the same having been duly considered, because it is the opinion of this Court that the writ 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.