

NO. 12-21-00096-CV

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

CARRIE M. LEO,
APPELLANT

§ *APPEAL FROM THE 2ND*

V.

§ *JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT*

LORI M. CAVITT, D/B/A
HENDERSON ANIMAL CARE
HOSPITAL,
APPELLEE

§ *CHEROKEE COUNTY, TEXAS*

MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM

This appeal is being dismissed for want of prosecution. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(b). Appellant, Carrie M. Leo, perfected this appeal on July 1, 2021. The reporter’s record was filed on September 20, 2021 and the clerk’s record was filed on December 20. Leo’s brief was due on or before January 19, 2022. Leo requested and received three extensions. We granted the third extension to April 19, ordered that no further extensions would be entertained, and warned that failure to file the brief by the extended deadline may result in the case being referred to the Court for dismissal.

The April 19 deadline passed, and Leo has not filed a brief, a motion for leave to file a late brief, or a motion for extension of time.¹ Accordingly, we *dismiss* the appeal for *want of prosecution*. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 38.8(a)(1), 42.3(b).

Opinion delivered April 29, 2022.

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

¹ Leo is acting pro se; however, pro se litigants are held to the same standards as licensed attorneys and must comply with all applicable rules of procedure; otherwise, pro se litigants would benefit from an unfair advantage over parties represented by counsel. *Muhammed v. Plains Pipeline, L.P.*, No. 12-16-00189-CV, 2017 WL 2665180, at *2 n.3 (Tex. App.—Tyler June 21, 2017, no pet.) (mem. op.).



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

APRIL 29, 2022

NO. 12-21-00096-CV

CARRIE M. LEO,

Appellant

V.

LORI M. CAVITT, D/B/A HENDERSON ANIMAL CARE HOSPITAL,

Appellee

Appeal from the 2nd District Court

of Cherokee County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 2020 020 053)

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record; and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this Court that this appeal should be dismissed for want of prosecution.

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is, hereby **dismissed for want of prosecution**; and that this decision be certified to the court below for observance.

By *per curiam* opinion.

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