

**CASE LAW UPDATE:
A SURVEY OF RECENT TEXAS
PARTNERSHIP AND LLC CASES**

By

Elizabeth S. Miller
Professor of Law
Baylor University School of Law
Waco, Texas

The University of Texas School of Law

2014 LLCs, LPs and PARTNERSHIPS

July 9, 10 & 11, 2014
Austin, Texas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.	1
II. Recent Texas Cases Involving General Partnerships.	1
A. Existence of Partnership.	1
B. Partner’s Personal Liability.	24
C. Power of Partner to Bind Partnership.	25
D. Partner’s Fiduciary Duty.	28
E. Fraudulent Inducement to Form and Continue Partnership.	36
F. Partnership Property.	37
G. Interpretation and Enforcement of Partnership Agreement.	41
1. Fiduciary Duties.	41
2. Financial Rights.	43
3. Voting Rights.	49
4. Transfer Restrictions and Buyout Provisions.	50
5. Covenants Not to Compete.	50
6. Withdrawal/Expulsion.	51
7. Statute of Frauds.	54
8. Illegality.	55
9. Arbitration Provisions.	56
10. Forum Selection Clause.	57
H. No-Compensation Rule.	57
I. Statutory Redemption of Withdrawn Partner.	57
J. Dissolution/Winding Up.	62
K. Injunctive Relief.	66
L. Divorce of Partner.	66
M. Partnership’s or Partner’s Standing to Sue.	69
N. Pro Se Representation.	70
O. Personal Jurisdiction.	70
P. Sufficiency of Pleadings and Service of Process on Partners or Partnership.	70
Q. Recovery of Attorney’s Fees in Suits Against Partnership or Suits Between Partners.	70
R. Limitations in Suit Against Partners After Judgment Against Partnership.	71
III. Recent Texas Cases Involving Limited Partnerships.	72
A. General Partner’s Personal Liability.	72
B. Authority of General Partner or Other Agent.	73
C. Statutory Liability Protection of Limited Partner.	76
D. Piercing Veil of Limited Partnership, General Partner, or Affiliate.	80
E. Partnership By Estoppel.	83
F. Fiduciary Duty of Partners and Affiliates.	83
G. Interpretation and Enforcement of Limited Partnership Agreement.	100
1. Fiduciary Duties.	100
2. Financial Rights.	105
3. Arbitration Provisions.	110
4. Transfer Restrictions and Buyout Provisions.	112
5. Removal of General Partner.	114
6. Dissolution.	115
7. Withdrawal of Limited Partner.	117
8. Amendment of Partnership Agreement.	120
9. Attorney’s Fees.	121

	10.	Indemnification.	121
	11.	Unilateral Mistake.	122
H.		Partnership Property.	123
I.		Assignment of Interest and Admission of Partner.	127
J.		Withdrawal of Limited Partner.	127
K.		Dissolution/ Winding Up.	128
L.		Record Keeping Requirements and Access to Books and Records.	130
M.		Receivership.	132
N.		Effect of Merger or Conversion.	132
O.		Divorce of Partner.	134
P.		Derivative Claims.	135
Q.		Creditor Remedies: Charging Order, Turnover Order.	141
R.		Bankruptcy.	142
S.		Securities Laws.	148
T.		Constitutionality of Margin Tax.	148
U.		Property Tax Exemption.	149
V.		Standing or Capacity to Sue.	150
W.		Personal Jurisdiction.	156
X.		Sufficiency of Pleadings and Service of Process on Partners or Limited Partnership.	157
Y.		Recovery of Attorney's Fees.	157
Z.		Issue Preclusion.	158
AA.		Diversity Jurisdiction.	158
BB.		Attorney Liability.	159
IV.		Texas Cases Involving Limited Liability Companies.	159
A.		Nature of Limited Liability Company.	159
B.		Pre-Formation Transactions.	161
C.		Fraud in Formation of LLC.	163
D.		LLC Property and LLC Membership Interest.	166
E.		Fiduciary Duties and Oppression.	172
F.		Limited Liability of Members; Personal Liability of Members Under Agency or Other Law.	193
G.		Authority of Member, Manager, or Officer.	203
H.		Admission of Member.	206
I.		Conflict Between Regulations/Company Agreement and Articles of Organization/Certificate of Formation.	207
J.		Transfer Restrictions and Buyout Provisions.	208
K.		Capital Contributions and Capital Call Provisions.	210
L.		Financial Rights.	211
M.		Record Keeping Requirements and Access to Books and Records.	216
N.		Forum Selection Clause.	217
O.		Dissolution/Winding Up.	217
P.		Withdrawal of Member.	219
Q.		Veil Piercing.	220
R.		Fraudulent Transfer	242
S.		Creditor's Remedies: Charging Order, Turnover Order, Garnishment.	249
T.		Franchise Tax.	253
U.		Series LLC.	256
V.		Property Tax Exemption.	257
W.		Workers' Compensation.	258
X.		Wage and Employment Laws.	259
Y.		Marital Property.	259
Z.		Recovery of Attorney's Fees.	261
AA.		Arbitration.	262
BB.		Personal Jurisdiction.	265
CC.		Service of Process	271

DD.	Venue.....	273
EE.	Standing or Capacity to Sue.....	273
FF.	Pro Se Representation.....	282
GG.	Derivative Suits.....	283
HH.	Diversity Jurisdiction.....	284
II.	Bankruptcy.....	285
JJ.	Securities Laws.....	294
KK.	Conflict of Laws.....	298
LL.	Res Judicata.....	302
MM.	Effect of Merger or Conversion.....	302
NN.	Professional LLC.....	305
OO.	Attorney-Client Privilege.....	306
PP.	Attorney Disqualification.....	306
V.	Texas Cases Involving Registered Limited Liability Partnerships.....	306
A.	Limited Liability of Partners.....	306
B.	Effect of Registration; LLP as “Successor” Partnership.....	310
C.	Effect of Withdrawal of Registration Upon Conversion.....	312
D.	Bankruptcy.....	313
E.	Suits Against Foreign LLPs.....	313
F.	Diversity Jurisdiction.....	315
G.	Pro Se Representation.....	315

Case Law Update: A Survey of Recent Partnership and LLC Cases

Elizabeth S. Miller

I. Introduction

This paper summarizes recent Texas cases involving issues of partnership and limited liability company law. Summaries of cases involving general and limited partnerships are provided for the current calendar year and the previous three calendar years. Because limited liability companies and limited liability partnerships are a relatively recent innovation in the law and the body of case law is more limited, summaries of cases involving these types of entities are provided from the inception of the case law on these entities in Texas.

II. Recent Texas Cases Involving General Partnerships

A. Existence of Partnership

Box v. Dallas Mexican Consulate General, Civil Action No. 3:08-cv-1010-O, 2014 WL 1012449 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 14, 2014).

Box, a licensed real estate broker, worked with the Dallas Mexican Consulate General (“Consulate”) in its search for a new location in Dallas. Box found a building for the Consulate to purchase, but the building was part of a three-building complex that the owner refused to subdivide. Box alleged that Consulate officials agreed to enter into a joint venture arrangement with Box whereby Box and possibly a third-party investor would buy the complex, subdivide it, and sell the building to the Consulate. Ultimately, the Consulate purchased the building from a third party. Box sued the Consulate contending that the Consulate breached the parties’ joint venture agreement. The Consulate argued that it was immune from suit, but Box relied on the commercial activity exception to sovereign immunity. Subject matter jurisdiction based on the commercial activity exception depended on the existence of the joint venture, and the court analyzed whether a joint venture between Box and the Consulate existed. The court applied Texas law to the issue of whether a joint venture was formed and set forth the common-law elements of a joint venture as well as the factors in the Texas Business Organizations Code that indicate the existence of a partnership. The court stated that a joint venture must be based on an express or implied agreement and is a question of law for the court. In addition to the intention of the parties, the court identified the elements of a joint venture as: (1) a community of interest in the venture, (2) an agreement to share profits, (3) an agreement to share losses, and (4) a mutual right of control or management of the enterprise. The court stated that joint ventures are normally indistinguishable from partnerships on the question of formation, and both are governed by the rules applicable to partnerships. The Texas Business Organizations Code sets forth the following five factors indicating the existence of a partnership: (1) receipt or right to receive a share of profits of the business; (2) expression of intent to be partners in the business; (3) participation or right to participate in control of the business; (4) agreement to share or sharing losses of the business or liability for claims by third parties against the business; and (5) agreement to contribute or contributing money or property to the business. Tex. Bus. Orgs. Code § 152.052(a). The court stated that the “most important factors” are the sharing of profits and control over the business. The court also noted that courts must examine the totality of the circumstances, that no single factor is determinative, and that the evidence in support of the factors is to be considered on a “continuum.” The court discussed Box’s affidavit and concluded that it was not clear whether Box formed a joint venture with the third-party investor or the Consulate or both. The court stated that the party seeking to prove the existence of a joint venture bears the burden of proof and must present evidence that both parties expressed an intent to be partners. Box did not show any expression by the Consulate of an intent to enter into a joint venture with Box. The court acknowledged that the absence of this factor was not determinative, but the court found Box failed to present evidence on the remaining factors as well. Because a joint venture between Box and the Consulate was never formed, the formation of the joint venture was not commercial activity that would except this claim from the general statutory sovereign immunity enjoyed by the Consulate, and the court was required to dismiss the claim.

Varosa Energy, Ltd. v. Tripplehorn, No. 01-12-00287-CV, 2014 WL 1004250 (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] Mar. 13, 2014, no pet. h.) (mem. op.).

The plaintiff sought to hold Tripplehorn and Aspen Development Company, LLC (“Aspen”) liable on a contract executed by Rollings on the basis that Rollings and Tripplehorn, on behalf of Aspen, formed a joint venture. The court

concluded that the evidence supported the jury's finding that the parties formed a joint venture under the judicial four-element definition of a joint venture: (1) a community of interest; (2) an agreement to share profits; (3) an agreement to share losses; and (4) a mutual right of control or management of the enterprise. The evidence showed a community of interest because Rollings and Tripplehorn agreed that each of them would pay half the purchase price of a rig that Rollings would refurbish and to which Tripplehorn would hold title. Then the parties would find a purchaser, and Tripplehorn would convey title to the purchaser. The evidence showed an express agreement to share all profits and losses, and a sharing of control was shown by Rollings' control of the refurbishment and responsibility for purchasing and selling the equipment while Tripplehorn held title and thus controlled whether to enter into a transaction for the sale of the equipment. Although the evidence supported the finding of the existence of a joint venture, an improper judgment was not caused by the trial court's disregard of the finding because the contract entered into by Rollings was only an obligation of Rollings and not an obligation of the joint venture.

MetroplexCore, L.L.C. v. Parsons Transportation, Incorporated, 743 F.3d 964 (5th Cir. 2014).

In this contracting dispute, MetroplexCore LLC ("MetroplexCore"), a Texas environmental engineering firm, sued Parsons Transportation Group, Inc. ("Parsons"), an Illinois general contracting firm that contracted with Harris County to design, build, and operate a Houston-area transit system. In an initial bid, Parsons included MetroplexCore as a "team member." Parsons did not win the bid, but several years later, after the initial contractor was unable to proceed, Harris County awarded Parsons (who had a new set of subcontractors) the contract for the remainder of the projects. After a few months, MetroplexCore notified Parsons that MetroplexCore believed it was entitled to a share of the profits. Parsons denied that it had an agreement with MetroplexCore, and MetroplexCore filed suit. In this appeal, MetroplexCore argued that the district court erred in granting Parsons' motion for summary judgment on the issue of the formation and existence of an enforceable joint venture. The court of appeals first set forth the common-law elements of a joint venture: (1) a community of interest in the venture; (2) an agreement to share profits; (3) an agreement to share losses, and (4) a mutual right of control or management of the enterprise. The court cited Texas case law and the definition of a partnership in Section 152.051(b) of the Texas Business Organizations Code as authority for the common-law elements of a joint venture and the proposition that a joint venture is governed by the rules applicable to a partnership. The court next set forth the five statutory factors for determining whether a partnership has been created: (1) receipt or right to receive a share of profits of the business, (2) expression of intent to be partners in the business, (3) participation or right to participate in control of the business, (4) agreement to share or sharing losses of the business or liability for claims by third parties against the business; and (5) agreement to contribute or contributing money or property to the business. Tex. Bus. Orgs. Code § 152.052(a). The court noted that the statute provides that an agreement to share losses is not necessary to create a partnership and that simply showing the right to share or sharing in gross returns or revenue is not enough by itself to show a partnership. Tex. Bus. Orgs. Code § 152.052(b)(3), (c). The court stated that the right to share profits and control of the business are generally considered the most important factors in establishing the existence of a partnership. The court acknowledged that MetroplexCore produced evidence of a "community of interest," as defined by Texas courts, but the court stated that this factor alone was insufficient to create a partnership or joint venture. With respect to profit sharing, MetroplexCore argued that there was an agreement to share the profits in 90% and 10% shares based on a letter stating that MetroplexCore would "participate in the contract to a minimum 10% level," but the court stated that the evidence did not make it clear whether MetroplexCore was entitled to 10% of the profits or 10% of some of other feature, such as workload or management responsibility. Further, Parsons produced evidence that it had profit-sharing joint-venture agreements with other collaborators and did not have a similar contract with MetroplexCore. Even if there were a fact question on the profit-sharing element, more evidence was needed to establish the existence of a joint venture, and the court stated that MetroplexCore did not meet either of the remaining common-law elements of a joint venture and did not argue or present evidence of the other statutory factors listed in Section 152.052(a). Finally, even if the evidence could support a finding of the existence of a joint venture with respect to the first phase of the project, it did not create a genuine issue of fact as to the second phase of the project. MetroplexCore's joint venture claim was entirely premised on the second phase of the project, and the district court thus correctly granted summary judgment on the claim.

Reservoir, Inc. v. Truesdell, __ F.Supp.2d __, 2014 WL 808026 (S.D. Tex. 2014).

Jarrah and Reservoir, Inc. opened a bar named "Rebels Honky Tonk" in Houston. After Jarrah leased the space for the bar, he enlisted the help of others, including Truesdell, to create and operate the bar. Jarrah and Truesdell worked together during the summer of 2009. Jarrah invested approximately \$400,000, and Truesdell contributed no funds but was actively involved in developing the country-western theme for the bar. Truesdell arranged for a designer and an artist to design and paint a logo and a mural. The relationship between Jarrah and Truesdell soured when Truesdell sought a

Also available as part of the eCourse

[LLCs, LPs and Partnerships 2014 Updates: Case Law and Secretary of State](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
2014 LLCs, LPs and Partnerships session

"Case Law Update"