AI Rules for Texas Litigators

Every published rule, order and standing order on generative AI in filings, for the Texas bankruptcy courts, the Texas federal district courts, the Fifth Circuit, the Texas state appellate and specialty courts, and the 43 counties of the Eastern District of Texas. **Current to 5 November 2026.**

John Henry · John Henry & Associates, PLLC · E.D. Tex. Bankruptcy Bench Bar, 6 November 2026

How this was compiled. Each requirement below was read in the court's own published document (court website, the Office of Court Administration's local-rules database at topics.txcourts.gov, govinfo, or the filed order) and the quoted words were checked against it. For each federal court, every district, magistrate and bankruptcy judge's page, procedures and standing orders were opened. For the counties, all 2,636 documents in the state's local-rules database were screened and every county's local rules and general standing orders were text-searched, with scanned documents converted to text. Where nothing was found, this reference says what was checked. Known limits are stated at the end. Rules change weekly; check the presiding judge's page before you file.

Key: VERIFY duty to check, no filing DISCLOSE statement in the filing CERTIFY IF USED CERTIFY ALWAYS whether or not AI was used FORBID PROPOSED

1. The bankruptcy courts of Texas

No Texas bankruptcy court requires an AI disclosure or certificate, and none of the 18 sitting bankruptcy judges, or Judge Parker on recall, has an AI order of their own. Each requires verification, enforced through Rule 9011.

Court	Rule	What it requires	Type
Bankr. E.D. Tex.	LBR 1001-1(i) (rev. Aug. 22, 2022), importing E.D. Tex. L.R. AT-3(m) (as of Feb. 9, 2026)	LBR 1001-1(i): the standards in "Local District Court Rule AT-3 ... apply in the Bankruptcy Court." AT-3(m): generative AI "should never replace the lawyer's most important asset - the exercise of independent legal judgment"; the lawyer "must review and verify all content." Only AT-3 is imported; CV-11(g) and the Crone and Love certificates are district-court rules. txeb.uscourts.gov/sites/txeb/files/2022%20LOCAL%20RULES_rev%20as%20of%208-22-22.pdf · txed.uscourts.gov/?q=node/14056/attachment/newest	VERIFY
Bankr. N.D. Tex.	General Order 2023-03 (June 21, 2023)	If any portion of a filing was drafted with generative AI, verify "that any language that was generated was checked for accuracy, using print reporters, traditional legal databases, or other reliable means." Sanctions under Rule 9011. **LBR 9029-3(a)** (rev. Dec. 1, 2025): the district's civil rules "do not apply in the Bankruptcy Court," so N.D. Tex. L.R. 7.2(f) disclosure does not apply to bankruptcy filings (it applies to briefs in a bankruptcy appeal in the district court). txnb.uscourts.gov/sites/txnb/files/news/General%20Order%202023-03%20Pleadings%20Using%20Generative%20Artificial%20Intelligence-signed.pdf	VERIFY
Bankr. S.D. Tex.	S.D. Tex. General Order 2025-04 (May 7, 2025), through BLR 1001-1(b) (eff. Oct. 29, 2026)	The signer "will be held responsible for the contents of that filing under Rule 11, regardless of whether generative artificial intelligence drafted any portion of that filing." BLR 1001-1(b): "the standing and general orders govern practice in the bankruptcy court." Both *In re Kheir* (which applied GO 2025-04) and *In re Rosslyn2016* predate this rule (Part 5). txs.uscourts.gov/sites/txs/files/general-orders/General_Order_2025-04_Use_of_Generative_AI_in_Court_Filings.pdf · txs.uscourts.gov/sites/txs/files/BK_Local_Rules_October_29_2026.pdf	VERIFY
Bankr. W.D. Tex.	Local Rules (eff. Feb. 3, 2025)	No AI provision. The local rules and the standing, archived and administrative orders on the court's site were text-searched. Rule 9011 governs.	—

Judges checked, no AI order: E.D. Tex.: Rhoades (C.J.), Searcy; Parker (recalled through July 22, 2027; no page). N.D. Tex.: Jernigan (C.J.), Larson, Everett, Mullin, Morris, Odell. S.D. Tex.: Rodriguez (C.J.), Isgur, Lopez, Pérez, Norman; complex-case procedures (Sept. 18, 2024). W.D. Tex.: Parker (C.J.), Robinson, Bradley, Thomas, King.

2. The federal district courts of Texas and the Fifth Circuit

Eastern District of Texas

Judge / rule	What it requires	Type
L.R. AT-3(m) (all attorneys, civil and criminal) and **L.R. CV-11(g)** (all civil litigants), as amended by GO 25-07 (Oct. 31, 2025, eff. Dec. 1, 2025)	Review and verify "all content" of anything prepared with generative AI; Rule 11 applies. GO 25-07 widened CV-11(g) from pro se to all litigants and from computer-generated content to all content. txed.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/goFiles/GO%2025-07%20Amending%20Local%20Rules.pdf	VERIFY
Proposed L.R. CR-57, GO 26-10 (Nov. 4, 2026)	"Attorneys for the government, attorneys for the defendant, and pro se defendants are all responsible for the accuracy of legal documents produced with the assistance of generative artificial intelligence technology ... must review and verify all content." Adopted subject to public notice and comment. txed.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/goFiles/GO-26-10_Amending_Local_Rules.pdf	PROPOSED
Judge Marcia A. Crone (Beaumont), Standing Order MC-11, signed July 20, 2026	"If a party utilizes AI to draft or assist in drafting a pleading, the party must include with the pleading a 'Certificate of Generative Artificial Intelligence Usage'": disclose the use, certify independent verification, and certify the use "has not resulted in the disclosure of confidential or privileged information to an unauthorized party." Civil and criminal, represented and pro se. txed.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/judgeFiles/Standing%20Order%20MC-11%20%287.15.26%29.pdf	CERTIFY IF USED
Magistrate Judge John D. Love (Tyler; a share of listed Tyler and Lufkin referral categories under GO 26-07), Standing Order, Apr. 9, 2025	"[A]ny party ... must include with all filings a 'Certificate of Generative Artificial Intelligence Usage'": AI used or not used, the tool, how it was used, and that accuracy of facts, background, citations and authority was checked. A filing without it is presumed to certify no AI use. File it with every filing. txed.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/judgeFiles/JDL%20Standing%20Order%20on%20AI%204.9.25.pdf	CERTIFY ALWAYS
Case orders	*Essandoh v. Capital One*, No. 4:25-cv-746 (Davis, M.J., Apr. 16, 2026) (pro se; certificate naming each tool, that case only). *McCormick v. Texakoma*, No. 4:25-cv-773 (Mazzant, C.J., June 11, 2026) (verification certificate binding the sanctioned attorney).	—

Checked, nothing further: Mazzant (C.J.), Gilstrap, Schroeder, Kernodle, Barker (Order Regulating Practice in Civil Cases, rev. Aug. 12, 2026, read in full), Truncale, Jordan, Schell (Sr.), Clark (Sr.); Magistrate Judges Hawthorn, Payne, Mitchell, Stetson, Baxter, Durrett, Davis, Bush (recalled). Laine (eff. Jan. 5, 2027) has no page yet. Local Patent Rules and criminal rules CR-1 to CR-59: no AI provision.

Northern District of Texas

Judge / rule	What it requires	Type

L.R. 7.2(f) (civil) and **LCrR 47.2(e)** (criminal), Special Order 2-98, eff. Sept. 3, 2024 (rules book eff. Sept. 1, 2026; its table of contents mislabels the rule "7.3")	"A brief prepared using generative artificial intelligence must disclose this fact on the first page under the heading 'Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence.'" (f)(3): a brief without it "certifies that no part of the brief was prepared using generative artificial intelligence." Applies to briefs. txnd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/documents/CIVRULES.pdf · txnd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/orders/2-98.pdf	DISCLOSE
Senior Judge Jane J. Boyle (Dallas), Judge-Specific Requirements, eff. Sept. 1, 2026	"No text generated by artificial intelligence may be used in any portion of any pleading, motion, brief, or other filing made by an attorney before Judge Boyle." AI may be used to identify errors if disclosed under 7.2(f); any edit made and verified by a human attorney. Every filing: a signed certificate "that the text was generated in its entirety by a human attorney," or it may be stricken. txnd.uscourts.gov/judge/senior-district-judge-jane-boyle	FORBID
Judge Matthew J. Kacsmaryk (Amarillo), Mandatory Certification Regarding Generative AI (undated)	With the notice of appearance, "a certificate attesting either that no portion of any filing will be drafted by generative artificial intelligence ... or that any language drafted by generative artificial intelligence will be checked for accuracy, using print reporters or traditional legal databases, by a human being." The court "will strike any filing from a party who fails to file a certificate." txnd.uscourts.gov/judge/judge-matthew-kacsmaryk · txnd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/documents/KacsmarykAICert.doc	CERTIFY ALWAYS (per case)
Judge Brantley Starr (Dallas)	His May 30, 2023 order, widely reported as the first of its kind, is withdrawn: he "no longer requires a certification ... in light of the Court's adoption of Local Civil Rule 7.2(f)."	—

Checked, nothing beyond 7.2(f): O'Connor (C.J.), Lindsay, Kinkeade, Scholer, Pittman, Hendrix, Brown (no requirements posted), Mitchell, Fish (Sr.), Fitzwater (Sr.), Cummings (Sr.), Means (Sr.), Godbey (Sr.); Magistrate Judges Cureton, Toliver, Horan, Ray, Reno, Rutherford, Parker, Burch, McKay.

Southern District of Texas

Judge / rule	What it requires	Type
General Order 2025-04 (Crane, C.J., May 7, 2025)	Filers "are cautioned against submitting ... any pleading, written motion, or other paper drafted using generative artificial intelligence ... without checking the submission for accuracy." The signer is responsible under Rule 11 "regardless of whether generative artificial intelligence drafted any portion of that filing." No certificate. Local Rules (reprinted Mar. 2026): no AI provision.	VERIFY
Judge Nicholas J. Ganjei (Houston), Court Procedures §§ 16(j), 30 (Nov. 2026)	Parties "shall certify at the end of all motions, responses, or replies" whether AI was used at any stage, "the specific type, program, or model of AI used," and, "signed by the lead attorney," that all factual and legal assertions comply with Rule 11. Separate page. "Negative responses (that is, the non-use of AI) likewise require a certification." Missing certificate or hallucinated authority: brief may be struck, attorney sanctioned. txs.uscourts.gov/sites/txs/files/Ganjei%20Court%20Procedures%20%28November%202026%29.pdf	CERTIFY ALWAYS
Judge Rolando Olvera (Brownsville), Civil Local Rules § 8.C (Oct. 6, 2026)	With the proposed scheduling order, "a certificate attesting either that no portion of any filing will be drafted by generative artificial intelligence (such as ChatGPT, Claude, Harvey.AI, or Google Bard) or that any language drafted by generative artificial intelligence will be checked for accuracy, using print reporters or traditional legal databases, by a person." The court "will strike any filing from a party who fails to file a certificate." txs.uscourts.gov/sites/txs/files/Judge%20Olvera%20Local%20Rules%20%28Civil%29%2010-06-26%20.pdf	CERTIFY ALWAYS (per case)

Judge Jeffrey V. Brown and Magistrate Judge Andrew M. Edison (Galveston), Rules of Practice R. 20	"Every pleading, motion, or other paper filed with the court must cite only legal authorities that the filing attorney or party has verified to exist. A paper that cites a nonexistent judicial decision or attributes fabricated language or a fabricated legal proposition to an authority will be struck from the record." txs.uscourts.gov/sites/txs/files/GalvestonDistrictCourtRulesofPractice.pdf	VERIFY
Judges Marina Garcia Marmolejo and John A. Kazen (Laredo), Civil Procedures § 8; Criminal § 7	AI-assisted filings must be "thoroughly reviewed for factual and legal accuracy prior to submission." "The Court will not accept the excuse that such content was prepared by AI, staff, or others when assessing potential violations of Rule 11 or applicable ethical obligations." Adopts GO 2025-04.	VERIFY

Checked, nothing beyond GO 2025-04: Crane (C.J.), Bennett, Colmenero, Ellison, Eskridge, Hanen, Hanks, Hittner (Sr.), Hoyt (Sr.), Lake (Sr.), Rainey (Sr.), F. Rodriguez, Rosenthal (Sr.), Tipton, Werlein (Sr.), Morales, Saldaña, Jones; Magistrate Judges Bryan, Alanis, R. Bennett, Hampton, Ho, Medrano, Palermo, Bajew, Betancourt, Bray, dos Santos, Hacker, Libby, Neurock, Quiroga, Torteya. **Not checked** (no page posted): Ramos, Marck.

Western District of Texas

Judge / rule	What it requires	Type
Judge Ernest Gonzalez (Del Rio), Standing Order Concerning the Use of AI (June 25, 2026), extending § 11(a) of his Standing Order Regarding Criminal Cases (June 23, 2026) to all cases	If AI drafted or assisted a pleading, include a "Certificate of Generative Artificial Intelligence Usage": "This document was generated with the assistance of [Name of Program] ... I hereby certify that I have independently verified the accuracy of the legal and factual assertions ... I further certify that the use of generative artificial intelligence has not resulted in the disclosure of any confidential or privileged information to any unauthorized party." Whether it reaches matters referred to the Del Rio magistrate judges is not stated. txwd.uscourts.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/EG-Standing-Order-on-AI-1st-draft-6-24-2026.pdf	CERTIFY IF USED
Local Rules (AT, CV, CR)	No AI provision; no CV-11.	—

Checked, nothing: Cardone, Schydlower, Briones (Sr.), Guaderrama (Sr.), Moses, X. Rodriguez, Biery, Pulliam, Garcia, Ezra (Sr.; one PDF returned 404), Alvarez (Sr.), Pitman, Davis, Nowlin (Sr.), Counts, Wolfe; Magistrate Judges Bemporad, Chestney, Farrer, Stephenson, Hightower, Howell, Lane, Gilliland, MacLemore, Griffin, Fannin, Cordova, Watters, Berton, Enriquez, Torres, Castañeda. All 196 standing orders on the court's site searched. Judge Albright resigned effective Aug. 31, 2026.

Fifth Circuit

No AI rule, by decision. The court proposed a certificate rule (5th Cir. R. 32.3) and in June 2024 "decided not to adopt a special rule regarding the use of artificial intelligence in drafting briefs at this time." Filings "shall be carefully checked for truthfulness and accuracy as the rules already require." "'I used AI' will not be an excuse for an otherwise sanctionable offense." Rules as amended to Dec. 1, 2025: no AI provision. *Fletcher v. Experian*, No. 25-20086 (Feb. 18, 2026): "the rules we have are well equipped to handle these types of cases." VERIFY

ca5.uscourts.gov/docs/default-source/default-document-library/court-decision-on-proposed-rule.pdf

3. Texas state courts

Court / rule	What it requires	Type

Supreme Court of Texas, Misc. Docket No. 26-9054 (June 26, 2026): proposed TRCP 13, TRAP 9.1 and 52.11, and proposed repeal of Rule 57	Proposed TRCP 13(c)(1): "By signing a court filing, the signer represents to the court that ... the signer reviewed the filing and verified its accuracy, including that the legal citations, quotations, and holdings are not fabricated." Proposed TRAP 9.1(d)(1) adds "record citations." Sanctions only after notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond; "lesser sanctions" before contempt, striking or dismissal, or a written explanation why they are insufficient; a written order with reasons. Comment: verification matters "regardless of whether artificial intelligence was used." **Status:** comments closed Sept. 1, 2026; the Court expected an Oct. 1 effective date; **no final order** on the Court's 2026 orders list as of Nov. 5 (latest 26-9082, Oct. 30). The appellate rules are still listed as last amended Feb. 6, 2026. txcourts.gov/media/1462936/269054.pdf	PROPOSED
Business Court, Local Rule 10(c) (rules eff. Oct. 1, 2026)	"Use of artificial intelligence is not prohibited, but the filing attorney or party is independently responsible for the accuracy of all filings and must comply with all legal and ethical duties, including TRCP 13 and Civil Practice and Remedies Code, Chapters 9-10." Unchanged from the Mar. 2025 version. txcourts.gov/media/1463407/tbc-local-rules-10126-with-signatures.pdf	VERIFY
Court of Criminal Appeals	No AI rule or order. Joint Technology Standards v11.0 (Misc. Dkt. 26-9059 / CCA 26-004) add only "Artificial Media" case-type codes.	—
Courts of appeals (all 15)	No local rule, IOP, standing order or briefing notice on AI at any of the 1st through 15th courts (local rules, IOPs and orders read for each). They sanction under inherent power; see Part 5.	—
Ethics Opinion 705 (Feb. 2025)	Advisory. Lawyers "should always verify the accuracy of any responses received from a generative AI tool" (Rules 1.01, 3.03); protect confidential information (1.05); supervise (cf. 5.03); do not charge for time "saved." legalethicstexas.com/resources/opinions/opinion-705/	advisory
Other	TDRPC: no AI amendment; a disciplinary-rules subcommittee is studying AI (Oct. 7, 2026). TRAIL (State Bar) recommended mandatory AI CLE for new lawyers and evidence rules on deepfakes; not adopted. Judicial Council (2024) recommended study of AI-manipulated evidence; no TRE proposal. TRAIGA (eff. Jan. 1, 2026) imposes no duty on litigants' filings. *In re Hughey*, No. 25-0463 (AI-recorded deposition), argued Oct. 6, 2026, awaiting opinion.	—

4. The 43 counties of the Eastern District of Texas (state trial courts)

County	Court · document	What it requires	Type
Denton	All district courts · Standing Order Regarding Use of Artificial Intelligence (signed May 8, 2026; on the county's site, not yet on the state's local-rules site, which Tex. R. Civ. P. 3a(c) requires for it to take effect). The Oct. 2025 order on the state site applies to those who use AI	"All attorneys and self-represented litigants who file pleadings, documents, or otherwise appear in a case shall sign and submit the appropriate attached certification form": AI content "verified as accurate through traditional (non-AI) legal sources by a human being," and responsibility for staff and co-counsel. A Uniform Attorney Certification covers "all of my pending and future court cases." dentoncounty.gov/DocumentCenter/View/11419	CERTIFY ALWAYS
	Probate courts · SO-2025-00002 (Dec. 12, 2025)	All litigants and attorneys, "whether or not they say they utilize any form of artificial intelligence," sign the certification. topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/2719	CERTIFY ALWAYS

Collin	County Courts at Law 1–7 · Standing Order No. 3 (July 3, 2024)	If AI was used "in any way," disclose it and "CERTIFY that each and every citation to the law, or the record in the filed document, has been verified and is accurate"; sample form is an unsworn declaration under penalty of perjury. Non-compliant filings may be struck. topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/2030	CERTIFY IF USED
	District courts · Local Rule 4.8 (May 6, 2026)	AI users "shall, before using any AI-generated information in a court submission or proceeding, ensure that such information is accurate and correctly portrayed to the court." topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/3015	VERIFY
Grayson	District courts and CCLs · Local Rule 1.13 (2025)	Certificate attached to each AI-assisted pleading (verified "through traditional (non-AI) legal sources"). "The use of artificial intelligence is prohibited in the Courtroom, or in Court offices," including to record or transcribe. topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/2265	CERTIFY IF USED COURTROOM
Wood	402nd District Court · Standing Order (Apr. 29, 2026)	AI users sign the certification (same text as Denton's original order). topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/2948	CERTIFY IF USED
Angelina	159th and 217th District Courts · Amended Standing Order (Sept. 25, 2026); original Sept. 3, 2026	AI users sign Exhibit A certifying AI material "was, before submission, verified as accurate through traditional (non-AI) legal sources by a human being." topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/3145	CERTIFY IF USED
	County Court at Law No. 2 · Standing Order (Sept. 16, 2026)	AI users include a verbatim sworn verification "in bold print"; without it the pleading "will not be considered by the Court." No confidential data into AI; no AI to create or alter evidence; no recording of proceedings to feed an AI program without the judge's written permission; no AI interpretation during a live hearing; no experts who rely on generative AI. Sanctions include a billing audit. topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/3153	CERTIFY IF USED COURTROOM
Panola	County Court at Law and County Court · Standing Order (Aug. 21, 2026)	Every attorney or self-represented litigant files a sworn verification with the first filing; "personally read and review all citations"; no confidential information into AI; no AI to create or alter evidence; no expert "that relies on AI programs or apps in their methodology." topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/3097	CERTIFY ALWAYS
Orange	District courts and CCLs · Local Rule 13 (2025)	A lawyer "must review and verify any computer generated content." topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/2342	VERIFY
Liberty	District courts and CCLs · Local Rule 3.6 (Aug. 2025)	Caution against filing AI-drafted papers "without checking the submission for accuracy." "The use of artificial intelligence to summarize, record, or translate proceedings is not allowed in the courtroom by any party, witness, or interpreter." topics.txcourts.gov/LocalRulesPublic/PreviewAttachment/2521	VERIFY COURTROOM

Searched, nothing found (35 counties): Anderson, Bowie, Camp, Cass, Cherokee, Cooke, Delta, Fannin, Franklin, Gregg, Hardin, Harrison, Henderson, Hopkins, Houston, Jasper, Jefferson, Lamar, Marion, Morris, Nacogdoches, Newton, Polk, Rains, Red River, Rusk, Sabine, San Augustine, Shelby, Smith, Titus, Trinity, Tyler, Upshur, Van Zandt. Fourteen of these have no documents in the state database at all. Smith's civil rules (approved 2000, Misc. Docket No. 00-9119; posted 2023) and Hopkins's rules are scanned images; converted to text, neither mentions AI.

5. Texas decisions on AI-fabricated or unverified authority (lawyers)

Court	Case	Date	Result
5th Cir.	Fletcher v. Experian Info. Sols., No. 25-20086 (Elrod, C.J.)	Feb. 18, 2026	$2,500 (FRAP 46(c), inherent power); evasiveness aggravated it
E.D. Tex.	Gauthier v. Goodyear, No. 1:23-cv-281, 2024 WL 4882651 (Crone, J.)	Nov. 25, 2024	$2,000; 1 hr AI CLE; order to client; applies AT-3(m)
E.D. Tex.	McCormick v. Texakoma Fin., No. 4:25-cv-773, 2026 WL 1746259 (Mazzant, C.J.)	June 11, 2026	Public reprimand; $5,000 penalty; response struck; review of all 2026 filings; CLE; verification certificate
Bankr. S.D. Tex.	In re Kheir, Adv. No. 25-3033, 674 B.R. 631 (Rodriguez, C.J.)	Nov. 4, 2025	Fees; 6 hrs AI CLE; copy to client; referral to State Bar; GO 2025-04 and Rule 9011
Bankr. S.D. Tex.	In re Rosslyn2016, LLC, No. 25-34507, ECF 312 (Rodriguez, C.J.)	July 14, 2026	6 hrs CLE; contempt; $29,877 to the trustee, jointly with petitioning creditors; Westlaw tool no defense
N.D. Tex.	Wilson v. KIPP Tex., No. 3:24-cv-2578-K (Kinkeade, J.)	Oct. 29, 2025	Fees for reply; 2 hrs AI CLE; ChatGPT-invented quotations in the client's declaration; silence under 7.2(f) a false certificate
N.D. Tex.	Shelton v. Parkland Health, No. 3:24-cv-2190-L-BW, 2025 WL 3141108 (McKay, M.J.)	Nov. 10, 2025	Reprimand under Rule 11 for citing nonexistent cases without reasonable inquiry; no willful 7.2(f)(3) violation found
N.D. Tex.	Herod v. Hobby Lobby, No. 3:25-cv-1484-BT (Rutherford, M.J.)	June 23, 2026	Counsel admitted fake case; no sanction stated
N.D. Tex.	Transcontinental Realty v. Moos, No. 3:26-cv-694-O-BW (McKay, M.J.)	July 28, 2026	Admonishment
N.D. Tex.	Williams v. DFW Int'l Airport Bd., No. 4:26-cv-433-P (Pittman, J.)	Aug. 27, 2026	Caution
S.D. Tex.	Truong v. Flint Hills Res., No. 2:24-cv-310 (Gonzales Ramos, J.)	Apr. 14, 2025	Show cause; counsel's letter named ChatGPT; plaintiffs nonsuited
S.D. Tex.	Elizondo v. City of Laredo, No. 5:25-cv-50 (Garcia Marmolejo, J.)	July 23, 2025	$2,500; 3 hrs CLE; order to client
S.D. Tex.	Montoya Cabanas v. Bondi, 2025 WL 3171331	Nov. 13, 2025	Warning
S.D. Tex.	Compañía General de Combustibles v. RGR Global Logistics, 2026 WL 1799690	June 23, 2026	Defense counsel ordered to produce case and name the tool
S.D. Tex.	GS Holistic v. AAR Mgmt., No. 3:24-cv-360 (Edison, M.J.)	July 8, 2026	Warning to defense counsel
W.D. Tex.	Gonzalez v. Tex. Taxpayers & Research Ass'n, No. 1:24-cv-880-RP (Pitman, J.)	Jan. 29, 2025	Response struck; $3,852.50 fees and $108.54 costs

W.D. Tex.	Thackston v. Driscoll, No. 5:24-cv-276-FB (Chestney, M.J.)	Aug. 28, 2025	R&R flags Rule 11(c) sanctions
W.D. Tex.	Yue v. Reaction Labs, 2026 WL 157144 (Pitman, J.)	Jan. 20, 2026	Warning
W.D. Tex.	Holmes v. Univ. of Tex. at Austin, 2026 WL 297630 (Pitman, J.)	Feb. 4, 2026	Show cause; outcome not found
W.D. Tex.	Thomas v. Quikrete, 2026 WL 594760 (Chestney, M.J.)	Feb. 26, 2026	Misquotation noted; no sanction
W.D. Tex.	Cain v. Hyatt Corp., No. 1:25-cv-2053 (Hightower, M.J.)	Aug. 5, 2026	Show cause to co-counsel
W.D. Tex.	Garcia Perez v. Blanche, No. 1:26-cv-786-RP (Pitman, J.)	Aug. 18, 2026	Strong caution; six nonexistent cases
Tex. App.–Waco	Ex parte Lee, 673 S.W.3d 755	July 19, 2023	Flagged; show cause declined
Tex. App.–Dallas	Rochon-Eidsvig v. JGB Collateral, No. 05-24-00123-CV	June 12, 2025	Brief struck; $2,500 fees; 8 hrs CLE
Tex. App.–Houston [1st]	In re Paula M. Miller, No. 01-26-00319-CV (Adams, C.J., concurring)	Apr. 23, 2026	Warning: "trust and verify"
Tex. App.–Houston [14th]	In re S.M.T., No. 14-25-00151-CV	July 30, 2026	3 hrs AI CLE, on the court's own motion
Tex. App.–Tyler	Higgins v. State, No. 12-25-00090-CR	July 31, 2026	AI memo at trial raised as ineffective assistance
Tex. App.–San Antonio	San Antonio ISD v. Becerra, No. 04-25-00724-CV	Aug. 5, 2026	Admonition; four AI-hallucinated cases
Tex. App.–Waco	In re Estate of Ford, No. 10-25-00313-CV	Oct. 29, 2026	Recounts trial-court show cause; no sanction
459th Dist. Ct., Travis	Ma v. Cogdell Law Firm, No. D-1-GN-25-001604	Oct. 22, 2025	$2,000; motion struck (secondary source)
250th Dist. Ct., Travis	Whitesock v. Bird Rides, No. D-1-GN-25-011111 (Liu, J.)	June 8, 2026	$10,000 fees, lawyer and firm jointly; fabricated Tort Claims Act quotation

Not counted: five decisions on fabricated or fictional citations that never mention AI (In re Obeginski, Tex. App.–Beaumont, Mar. 12, 2026, which left in place a trial court's order to attach highlighted copies of all cited authority; Guerra-Quezada v. United States, 5th Cir.; Garibay-Robledo v. Noem, N.D. Tex., where counsel said the case came from a Facebook comment; Cristancho v. SWBC Mortg., S.D. Tex.; In re Q.C., Tex. App.–Fort Worth). About 67 further Texas and Fifth Circuit decisions involve pro se litigants (Charlotin, AI Hallucination Cases database, through Oct. 29, 2026). No Texas lawyer-discipline action for AI misuse found. No AI-citation decision found from the E.D., N.D. or W.D. Tex. bankruptcy courts or the Business Court.

6. Watch list and limits

- **TRCP 13 / TRAP 9.1:** final order on Misc. Dkt. 26-9054 expected; check txcourts.gov/supreme/administrative-orders.
- **E.D. Tex. CR-57** (GO 26-10): in notice and comment.

- **Bankr. E.D. Tex. local rules revision:** presented Nov. 6, 2026; no proposed text published as of Nov. 5.
- **Limits:** orders posted only on an individual state judge's own web page and not in the state database could be missed; two S.D. Tex. judges have no page posted; secondary sources are identified where used.