

38<sup>th</sup> Annual Page Keeton Civil Litigation Conference  
October 23-24, 2014  
Four Seasons Hotel, Austin, Texas

## **PROVING YOUR ATTORNEY FEES IN LITIGATION**

**Tracey R. Keegan**

Tracey R. Keegan  
Schick & Copeland LLP  
3700 Buffalo Speedway, Suite 370  
Houston, Texas 77098

[tkeegan@schickcopeland.com](mailto:tkeegan@schickcopeland.com)  
832-849-1805

## Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	SPECIFIC TYPES OF CLAIMS.....	1
A.	CPRC Chapter 38 Recovery .....	1
1.	Types of actions covered .....	1
2.	Elements of recovery .....	2
3.	Whether a net recovery is required to prevail .....	2
4.	Presentment requirement.....	3
B.	Counterclaims.....	4
1.	If the main claim permits recovery of fees, a party may recover fees for .. defending a related counterclaim.....	4
2.	“Mirror-image” declaratory judgment counterclaims do not give rise to .. UDJA fee ess the plaintiff sought UDJA relief .....	4
C.	Attorney’s fees in Texas class actions.....	5
D.	Equal Access to Justice Act.....	5
1.	Proving net worth of an entity plaintiff.....	5

2.	Cost of Living Adjustment.....	5
III.	PROVING ATTORNEY'S FEES .....	6
A.	Proving that fees are reasonable and necessary in federal court – <i>Johnson</i> .....	6
B.	Proving that fees are reasonable and necessary in Texas state court – <i>Arthur</i> .....	
	<i>Anderson</i> .....	7
C.	Recent cases addressing particular <i>Arthur Anderson</i> and <i>Johnson</i> factors .....	8
1.	Time and labor required.....	8
2.	Preclusion of other employment .....	9
3.	Fee customarily charged in the locality for similar legal services .....	10
4.	Amount involved and results obtained.....	11
5.	Time limitations imposed by client or circumstances.....	11
6.	Nature and length of professional relationship with the client.....	11
7.	Experience, reputation, and ability of lawyers performing services .....	11
8.	Whether fee is fixed or contingent, or collection is uncertain .....	12
B.	Manner of proof .....	12
1.	Testimony of case counsel and other experts.....	12
2.	Time sheets or other billing records.....	12

3.	Segregation of fees .....	13
4 .	Manner and sufficiency of segregation.....	13
5.	Effect of uncontroverted testimony or affidavit.....	14
6.	Judicial notice.....	15
IV.	FEES AS SANCTIONS .....	15
A.	CPRC Chapter 10 sanctions.....	15
B.	Usual “reasonable and necessary” test does not apply.....	16
C.	Availability of fees as sanction after non-suit.....	16

## Cases

<i>7979 Airport Garage</i>	
2007 WL 1732223 .....	4, 14
<i>Adams v. First Nat'l Bank of Bells/Savoy</i>	
154 S.W.3d 859 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2005, no pet.).....	4
<i>Ahrenhold v. Sanchez</i>	
229 S.W.3d 541 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2007, no pet.).....	15
<i>Arthur Andersen &amp; Co. v. Perry Equip. Corp.</i>	
945 S.W.2d 812 (Tex. 1997).....	7, 8, 12
<i>Baker v. Bowen</i>	
839 F.2d 1075, 1084 (5th Cir. 1988) .....	6
<i>Blizzard v. Nationwide Mut. Fire Ins. Co.</i>	
756 S.W.2d 801, 806-07 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1988, no writ) .....	2
<i>Brazos Electric Power Coop., Inc. v. Weber</i>	
238 S.W.3d at 582 (Tex. App. – Dallas 2007, no. pet.).....	10, 11
<i>Bryan v. Bryan</i>	
No. 04-06-00553-CV, 2007 WL 2042759, *2 (Tex. App.—San Antonio July 18, 2007, no pet.) (mem. op.).....	11
<i>Cf. Land Rover U.K. Ltd. v. Hinojosa</i>	
210 S.W.3d 604 (Tex. 2006) .....	9
<i>City of Burlington v. Dague</i>	
505 U.S. 557 (1992).....	7
<i>City of Houston v. Levingston</i>	
221 S.W.3d 204, 236-37 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, no pet. h.) .....	12
<i>City of Laredo v. Montano</i>	
414 S.W.3d 731 (Tex. 2013).....	9
<i>Cognata v. Down Hole Injection, Inc.</i>	
375 S.W.3d 370 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2012, pet. denied).....	16
<i>Cox v. Wilkins</i>	
No. 03-05-00110-CV, 2006 WL 821202, *7 (Tex. App.—Austin Mar. 31, 2006, pet. denied) (mem. op.) .....	15
<i>Diamond v. San Soucie</i>	
239 S.W.3d 428 (Tex. App. – Dallas, 2007, no pet. ....)	14
<i>Dilston House Condo. Ass'n v. White</i>	
230 S.W.3d 714 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2007, no pet.) .....	7
<i>Doolin's Harley- Davidson, Inc. v. Young</i>	
No. 06-05-00101-CV, 2006 WL 27983, (Tex. App.—Texarkana Jan. 6, 2006, no pet.) (mem. op.).....	16
<i>Eitel v. Horobec</i>	
No. 02-12-00500-CV, 2014 WL 584780 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth, 2014, no pet h.) ..	14
<i>El Apple I, Ltd. v. Olivas</i>	
414 S.W.3d 757 (Tex. 2012).....	7, 8, 9, 12
<i>Ellis v. Waldrop</i>	
656 S.W.2d 902, 905 (Tex. 1983).....	4
<i>Fire Ins. Exch. v. Sullivan</i>	
192 S.W.3d 99, 109-10 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2006, pet. denied) .....	2

<i>First City Nat'l Bank of Midland v. Concord Oil Co.</i>	
808 S.W.2d 133 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1991, no writ) .....	5
<i>Fralick v. Plumbers &amp; Pipefitters Nat'l Pension Fund</i>	
2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 13672, (N.D. Tex. 2011) .....	12
<i>Gammill v. Jack Williams Chevrolet, Inc.</i>	
972 S.W.2d 713 (Tex. 1998).....	12
<i>Gate Guard Services L.P. v. Perez</i>	
No. V-10-91, 2014 WL 1379189 (S.D. Tex. 2014).....	5, 6
<i>Gibson v. Cuellar</i>	
No. 14-12-00644-CV, 2013 WL 4759593 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2013, no pet. h.) .....	1, 3
<i>Giles v. Gen. Elec. Co.</i>	
245 F.3d 474 (5th Cir. 2001) .....	7
<i>Goin v. Calvin</i>	
No. 3:12-CV-2471-B, 2013 WL 1797862 (N.D. Tex. 2013) .....	6
<i>Green Intl., Inc. v. Solis</i>	
951 S.W.2d 384, (Tex. 1997).....	2
<i>Haberman v. PNC Mortg. Co.</i>	
915 F.Supp.2d 800 (E.D. Tex. 2013).....	10
<i>Hamblen v. Colvin</i>	
No. 3:12-CV-2009, 2014 WL 1516157 (N.D. Tex. 2014) .....	6
<i>Hartford Cas. Ins. Co. v. Budget Rent-A-Car Sys., Inc.</i>	
796 S.W.2d 763, (Tex. App.—Dallas 1990, writ denied) .....	5
<i>Heidtman v. County of El Paso</i>	
171 F.3d 1038 (5th Cir. 1999) .....	7
<i>Hensley v. Eckerhart</i>	
461 U.S. 424 (1983).....	12
<i>Hernandez v. Lautensack</i>	
201 S.W.3d 771, 777 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2006, pet. denied).....	3
<i>Holloway v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i>	
No. 3:12-CV-2184 (N. D. Tex. 2014).....	14
<i>Hunsucker v. Fustok</i>	
238 S.W.3d 421(Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2007, no pet. h.) .....	14
<i>Imperial Lofts, Ltd. v. Imperial Woodworks, Inc.</i>	
2007 WL 4157245, (Tex. App.—Waco Nov. 7, 2007, no pet. h.) .....	2
<i>In re M.A.N.M.</i>	
231 S.W.3d 562 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2007, no pet.) .....	8
<i>Intercontinental Group P'ship v. KB Home Lone Star LP</i>	
295 S.W.3d 650 (Tex. 2009).....	2
<i>Jespersen v. Sweetwater Ranch Apartments</i>	
390 S.W.3d 644, 661 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2012, no pet.) .....	2
<i>Johnson v. Georgia Highway Express, Inc.</i>	
488 F.2d 714 (5th Cir. 1974).....	7, 8, 9, 11
<i>Jones v. Kelley</i>	
614 S.W.2d 95, 100 (Tex. 1981) .....	3

<i>Kazman v. Frontier Oil Corp.</i>	
398 S.W.3d 377 (Tex. App.—Houston [14 <sup>th</sup> Dist.] 2013, no pet.).....	5
<i>Keith v. Keith</i>	
221 S.W.3d 156 (Tex. App.— Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, no pet.).....	8
<i>Kreighbaum v. Lester</i>	
No. 05-06-01333-CV, 2007 WL 1829729, (Tex. App.—Dallas June 27, 2007, no pet. h.) .....	1
<i>Long v. Griffin</i>	
-- S.W.3d --, 57 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 470 (Tex. April 25, 2014) .....	9
<i>Louisiana Power &amp; Light Co. v. Kellstrom</i>	
50 F.3d 319 (5th Cir. 1995) .....	12
<i>Low v. Henry</i>	
221 S.W.3d 609, 620-21 (Tex. 2007) .....	15, 16
<i>Mandell v. Mandell</i>	
214 S.W.3d 682 (Tex. App.—Houston [14 <sup>th</sup> Dist.] 2007, no pet.).....	9, 11
<i>Marrs and Smith P'ship v. Sombrero Oil and Gas Co., LLC</i>	
-- S.W.3d -- , 2014 WL 1999006 at *7 (Tex. App.—El Paso, May 16, 2014, no pet.)..	4
<i>McClain v Lufkin Indus., Inc.</i>	
649 F.3d 374 (5th Cir. 2011) .....	10
<i>McElroy v. Teague Hous. Auth.</i>	
10-10-00009-CV, 2012 WL 149227 (Tex. App. –Waco 2012, no pet.).....	15
<i>McKinley v. Drozd</i>	
685 S.W.2d 7, 10-11 (Tex. 1985).....	2
<i>Medical City Dallas, Ltd. v. Carlisle Corp.</i>	
251 S.W.3d 55 (Tex. 2008) .....	2
<i>Mercier v. Southwestern Bell Yellow Pages, Inc.</i>	
214 S.W.3d 770, 777 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2007, no pet.).....	12
<i>Migis v. Pearle Vision, Inc.</i>	
135 F.3d 1041 (5th Cir.1998) .....	7
<i>Mustapha v. HSBC Bank, USA</i>	
No. 4:12-CV-01924, 2013 WL 2338198 (S.D. Tex. 2013) .....	14
<i>Ragsdale v. Progressive Voters League</i>	
801 S.W.2d 880 (Tex. 1990).....	14
<i>Rodriguez, et al. v. Country Wide Home Loans, Inc.</i>	
No. 02-10605, 2014 WL 4230821 (S.D. Tex. August 22, 2014) .....	10
<i>Rutherford v. Harris County, Texas</i>	
197 F.3d 173 (5th Cir. 1999) .....	6
<i>Sandles v. Howerton</i>	
163 S.W.3d 829 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2005, no pet.).....	8
<i>Save Our Springs Alliance, Inc.</i>	
v. Lazy Nine Mun. Utility Dist., 198 S.W.3d 300 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 2006, pet. denied).....	4, 5
<i>Scott &amp; White Mem'l Hosp. v. Schexnider</i>	
940 S.W.2d 594 (Tex. 1996).....	16

<i>Sheffield Dev. Co. v. Carter &amp; Burgess, Inc.</i>	
2012 Tex. App. LEXIS 10599, 2012 WL 6632500 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2012) (pet. dismd.) .....	14
<i>Shin-Con Dev. Corp. v. I.P. Investments, Ltd.</i>	
270 S.W.3d 759, 768 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2008, pet. denied) .....	4
<i>Shipes v. Trinity Indus.</i>	
987 F.2d 311 (5th Cir. 1993) .....	7
<i>Stewart Title Guaranty v. Sterling</i>	
822 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1991).....	13
<i>Taylor v. Colvin</i>	
No. 3:12-CV-2750-P-BN, 2014 WL 696494 (N.D. Tex. 2014).....	6
<i>Testarossa Motors, Inc. v. Tinsley</i>	
No. 04-06-00350-CV, 2007 WL 120649, *1 (Tex. App.—San Antonio Jan. 19, 2007, no pet. h.) .....	3
<i>Tony Gullo Motors I, L.P. v. Chapa</i>	
212 S.W.3d 299 (Tex. 2006).....	13, 14
<i>Travelers Indem. Co. v. Espinosa</i> , No. 01-05-00836-CV, 2007 WL 1559936, at *3 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Mar. 31, 2007, no pet.) (mem op.).....	10
<i>Twin City Fire Ins. Co. v. Vega-Garcia</i>	
223 S.W.3d 762 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2007, pet. denied).....	12
<i>Univ. of Texas Medical Branch v. Shultz</i>	
195 S.W.3d 98 (Tex. 2006).....	16
<i>Varner v. Cardenas</i>	
218 S.W.3d 68, 69 (Tex. 2007) (per curiam).....	4, 13
<i>Walker v. United States Dep’t of Hous. &amp; Urban Dev.</i>	
99 F.3d 761 (5th Cir. 1996) .....	7
<i>Watkins v. Fordice</i>	
7 F.3d 453, 457 (5th Cir. 1993) .....	7
<i>Woollett v. Matyastik</i>	
23 S.W.3d 48 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) .....	12
<b>Statutes</b>	
28 U.S.C. § 2412.....	5, 6
TEXAS BUS. & COMM. CODE § 17 .....	1
28 U.S.C. § 2412(d) .....	5, 6
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM CODE § 38.....	passim
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 10.....	15, 16
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 26.....	5
TEX. R. CIV. PROC. § 42 .....	5
TEX. R. EVID. § 702.....	12
TEX. PROP. CODE § 21.109(b) .....	11
TEX. PROP. CODE § 24.006.....	15
<b>Rules</b>	
Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11 .....	16
Tex. Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 104 .....	8
Tex. R. Civ. P., Rule 13 .....	15
Tex. R. Civ. P., Rule 162 .....	16

Tex. R. Civ. P., Rule 54 .....	4
--------------------------------	---

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The last few years have seen significant developments in Texas state and federal law on the requirements for proving attorney's fees in civil litigation. Below is a discussion of recent significant cases on proving attorney's fees.

## **II. SPECIFIC TYPES OF CLAIMS**

Correctly identifying the basis for recovering fees is crucial to proving an entitlement to fees. When a party pleads a specific ground for recovery of attorney's fees, the party is limited to that ground and cannot recover attorney's fees on another, unpled ground. *See Kreighbaum v. Lester*, No. 05-06-01333-CV, 2007 WL 1829729, \*2-3 (Tex. App.—Dallas June 27, 2007, no pet. h.) (because appellants' counterclaim specifically requested attorney's fees under Section 17.50(c) of the Business and Commerce Code, appellant could not seek fees on another basis in reliance on a prayer for relief containing a nonspecific request for attorney's fees). However, a party is not required to specifically plead the applicable statute in order to recover attorney's fees under it. *Gibson v. Cuellar*, No. 14-12-00644-CV, 2013 WL 4759593 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2013, no pet. h.) (finding claim for attorney's fees was properly pleaded in plaintiff's petition when the claim was included in the breach of contract claim and generally in the prayer, despite not referencing Section 38.001 of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code).

Recent cases on specific grounds for fee recovery are discussed below:

### **A. CPRC Chapter 38 Recovery**

#### **1. Types of actions covered**

Under section 38.001 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, a person may recover reasonable attorney's fees from an individual or corporation, in addition to the amount of a valid claim and costs, if the claim is for:

- (1) rendered services;
- (2) performed labor;
- (3) furnished material;
- (4) freight or express overcharges;
- (5) lost or damaged freight or express;
- (6) killed or injured stock;
- (7) a sworn account; or
- (8) an oral or written contract.

TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM CODE § 38.001.

The Texas Supreme Court has held that a party may recover attorney's fees under a breach of express warranty claim pursuant to section 38.001(8). *Medical City Dallas, Ltd. v. Carlisle Corp.*, 251 S.W.3d 55 (Tex. 2008).

While Chapter 38 expressly applies to actions for recovery on an oral or written contract, parties to a particular contract may agree to fee-recovery arrangements that are stricter or more lenient than those imposed by Chapter 38. *See, e.g., Jespersen v. Sweetwater Ranch Apartments*, 390 S.W.3d 644, 661 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2012, no pet.) (failure to present claim as required by §38.002(2) did not preclude award of attorney's fees where lease agreement's attorney's fee provision did not require presentation as prerequisite).

## **2. Elements of recovery**

To recover attorney's fees under section 38.001, a party must (1) prevail on a cause of action for which attorney's fees are recoverable, and (2) recover damages. *See Imperial Lofts, Ltd. v. Imperial Woodworks, Inc.*, 2007 WL 4157245, \*4 (Tex. App.—Waco Nov. 7, 2007, no pet. h.) (citing *Green Intl., Inc. v. Solis*, 951 S.W.2d 384, 390 (Tex. 1997)).

In *Intercontinental Group P'ship v. KB Home Lone Star LP*, 295 S.W.3d 650 (Tex. 2009), a jury found that a property developer breached a written contract with a homebuilder but awarded no damages, although it did award \$66,000 in attorney's fees. The trial court entered judgment for the homebuilder in the amount of the jury's attorney's fee award, which was affirmed by the court of appeals. The developer petitioned for review in the Supreme Court, where the homebuilder argued that while the jury's failure to award damages precluded an award of attorney's fees under Chapter 38, the fee award was nonetheless proper because the underlying contract provided for recovery of attorney's fees by the "prevailing party" in any dispute on the contract. In a 5-4 majority opinion, the Supreme Court reversed the judgment, holding that the jury's finding of breach may have made the builder "a nominal winner" but that it was not a "prevailing party" where it received no award on its claim for monetary damages, no declaratory or injunctive relief, no consent decree or favorable settlement and where "[n]o misconduct was punished or deterred, no lessons taught." *Id.* at 655.

## **3. Whether a net recovery is required to prevail**

A prevailing plaintiff can satisfy the damage recovery element of Chapter 38 without obtaining a net recovery, provided that the zero recovery results from offsetting claims. *McKinley v. Drozd*, 685 S.W.2d 7, 10-11 (Tex. 1985) (party was entitled to attorney's fees for successful breach of contract claim even though damages were offset by opposing party's counterclaim on a separate contract).

However, the "no-net-recovery" exception to the damages recovery element does not apply when the damages awarded by the jury are offset by settlement credits or insurance payment credits. *See Imperial Lofts*, 2007 WL 4157245 at \*4. In *Imperial Lofts*, the jury awarded damages to the plaintiff, but because the settlement credits and insurance payment offsets exceeded the jury's damage award, the court held that the plaintiff was not the prevailing party and was not entitled to recover his attorneys' fees. *Id.* at \*4-5 (citing *Blizzard v. Nationwide Mut. Fire Ins. Co.*, 756 S.W.2d 801, 806-07 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1988, no writ) ("It is one thing to allow a party an award of attorney fees on a successful claim notwithstanding an opposing party's success on an offsetting claim. It is quite another to allow attorney fees on a claim which, although successful, was paid in full before trial."); *Fire Ins. Exch. v. Sullivan*, 192 S.W.3d 99, 109-10 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2006, pet. denied) (homeowner was not entitled

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](http://utcle.org/elibrary)

## Title search: Proving Your Attorney Fees in Litigation

Also available as part of the eCourse

[Civil Litigation: Proving Your Attorney Fees; Follow the Money; plus Extraordinary Remedies](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
38<sup>th</sup> Annual Page Keeton Civil Litigation Conference session  
"Proving Your Attorney Fees in Litigation"