

Presented:

Conference on State and Federal Appeals

June 5-6, 2014
Austin, TX**Extreme Brief Makeover**

by

Hon. Scott A. Brister

and

Kendall M. Gray
Andrews Kurth LLP

Note: Portions of this paper were
converted from a scanned image.

The conversion has been
reviewed for accuracy; however,
minor spelling or text-conversion
errors may still be present.

Andrews Kurth LLP
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 1700
Austin, TX 78701
www.andrewskurth.com

ScottBrister@andrewskurth.com
512-542-5220

Andrews Kurth LLP
600 Travis Street, Suite 4200
Houston, Texas 77002
www.andrewskurth.com

kendallgray@andrewskurth.com
713-220-3981

Scott A. Brister



Partner

111 Congress Avenue
Suite 1700
Austin, TX 78701
P: +1.512.320.9220
F: +1.512.542.5220
ScottBrister@andrewskurth.com

Scott is head of the firm's appellate section and his practice includes all aspects of litigation. He returned to Andrews Kurth in 2009 after 20 years of judicial service at all levels of the Texas court system: six years on the Texas Supreme Court, three years as Justice and Chief Justice of the First and Fourteenth Courts of Appeals respectively, and eleven years as Judge of the 234th District Court. During those years he presided over 670 trials to verdict, and authored more than 600 appellate opinions, including 122 opinions of the Texas Supreme Court.

Scott is board-certified in civil appellate, civil trial and personal injury trial law. He previously served on the Supreme Court Advisory Committee and on the Supreme Court Jury Task Force. He is a co-author of *Texas Pretrial Practice* and has written law review articles in the Baylor, Oak Brook, South Texas, and St. Mary's law reviews.

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION

- Recognized as a "Local Litigation Star" in Texas by *Benchmark Litigation* (2012-2014)
- Recognized as a "Local Litigation Star" in the 5th Circuit (Texas) by *Benchmark Appellate* (2013)
- *The Best Lawyers in America*, Appellate Practice (2012-2014)
- Texas Super Lawyer in Appellate Law, *Texas Monthly* (2013)
- Profiled as one of the leading Appellate (2010-2014) lawyers in Texas, *Chambers & Partners USA: America's Leading Business Lawyers*

BRIEFINGS, SEMINARS & SPEECHES

- TexasBarCLE 27th Annual Advanced Civil Appellate Practice Course (September 12-13, 2013)
- 2013 Legislative and Supreme Court Update, Houston Bar Association Civil/Appellate 2013 Bench Bar Conference, Houston, Texas (May 2, 2013)
- TexasBarCLE Judges Panel: How to Lose Your Case Through Poor Legal Writing (April 26, 2013)
- "Jury Charge: The Swinging Pendulum of Broad Form Submission," The History of Texas Supreme Court Jurisprudence, Austin, Texas (April 11, 2013)
- TexasBarCLE: 26th Annual Advanced Civil Appellate Practice Course (September 7, 2012)
- DRI's 10th Appellate Advocacy Seminar (June 21, 2012)

PRACTICES

Appellate
Commercial Litigation
Litigation and Dispute Resolution

EDUCATION

JD, 1980, *cum laude*,
Harvard Law School
Judicial Clerkship for
Chief Justice Greenhill
at the Texas Supreme
Court (1980-1981)
BA, 1977, *summa cum
laude*, Duke University

ADMISSIONS

Texas 1980
US District Courts for
the Northern, Southern,
Eastern and Western
Districts of Texas
US Court of Appeals for
the Fifth Circuit
US Supreme Court

Scott A. Brister

- Speaker, "Texas School Funding: How Much is Enough?" Texas Public Policy Foundation, 10th Annual Policy Orientation for the Texas Legislature (January 12, 2012)
- "Respondent's Strategies in the Supreme Court," presented at The Texas Bar CLE: Practice Before the Texas Supreme Court, Austin, Texas (April 15, 2011)
- Panelist, The University of Texas School of Law's 15th Annual Insurance Law Institute (October 14-15, 2010)

AFFILIATIONS

- Justice, Texas Supreme Court (2003-2009)
- Chief Justice, Fourteenth Court of Appeals (2001-2003)
- Justice, First Court of Appeals (2001)
- Judge, 234th District Court of Harris County (1989-2000)
- Board Certified - Civil Appellate, Civil Trial & Personal Injury Law Texas
- Fellow, Texas Bar Foundation, Houston Bar Foundation (1992-present)
- College of the State Bar of Texas (1990-present)

IN THE NEWS

- Featured in "Former Justice Scott Brister Talks About Experience, Amici and Activist Judges," Texas Lawyer (September 27, 2010)

PRESS RELEASES

- Andrews Kurth Continues to Receive High Marks for Litigation Practice from Benchmark Litigation (January 9, 2014)
- 41 Andrews Kurth Lawyers Named in Texas Super Lawyers 2013 (September 9, 2013)
- 61 Andrews Kurth Lawyers Named Best Lawyers in America 2014 (August 15, 2013)
- Andrews Kurth Receives High Marks from *2013 Chambers & Partners USA Guide* (May 24, 2013)
- Andrews Kurth Receives High Accolades in Litigation and Appellate Practices from Benchmark Litigation (November 7, 2012)
- 62 Andrews Kurth Lawyers Named Best Lawyers in America 2013 (August 23, 2012)
- Andrews Kurth Receives High Marks from *2012 Chambers & Partners USA Guide* (June 15, 2012)
- Andrews Kurth Receives High Accolades in Litigation and Appellate Practices (December 16, 2011)
- 54 Andrews Kurth Lawyers Named Best Lawyers in America 2012 (September 22, 2011)
- Andrews Kurth Partner Scott A. Brister to Speak at The Federalist Society, Houston Lawyers Chapter (September 28, 2009)
- Former Supreme Court Justice Scott A. Brister Joins Andrews Kurth (September 8, 2009)
- Texas Supreme Court Justice Scott A. Brister to Join Andrews Kurth (August 17, 2009)

Kendall M. Gray



Partner

Waterway Plaza Two
10001 Woodloch Forest Dr.
Suite 200
The Woodlands, TX 77380
P: +1.713.220.4838
F: +1.713.220.7183
kendallgray@andrewskurth.com

600 Travis
Suite 4200
Houston, TX 77002
P: +1.713.220.3981
F: +1.713.220.4285

Kendall is a board certified civil appellate specialist who has represented clients in state and federal appellate courts such as the U.S. Supreme Court, the U.S. Courts of Appeal for the Fifth, Ninth, Tenth and Federal Circuits, the Supreme Court of Texas and many intermediate courts of appeal. His practice includes a variety of complex commercial, medical malpractice, managed care, and toxic tort matters, as well as a particular focus in disputes involving employee benefits, managed care, and ERISA.

REPRESENTATIVE EXPERIENCE

- *Christus Health Gulf Coast v. Aetna, Inc.*, 397 S.W.3d 651 (Tex. 2013)
- *Ford, Bacon & Davis, LLC v. Travelers Ins. Co.*, 635 F.3d 734 (5th Cir. 2011)
- *Klein v. Hernandez*, 315 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. 2010)
- *Zimmerman v. Anaya*, 315 S.W.3d 523 (Tex. 2010)
- *Man Indus. (India) Ltd. v. Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ, Ltd.*, 309 S.W.3d 589 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2010, no writ)

PUBLICATIONS

- "Commentary: Pinnacle of Practice Requires Creativity" *Texas Lawyer* (April 8, 2013)
- "Commentary: Unleash the Mind's Power by Going Analog" *Texas Lawyer* (January 7, 2013)
- "Commentary: Why Lawyers Need (Yet Don't Hire) Coaches" *Texas Lawyer* (December 10, 2012)
- "Storytelling for Lawyers" *Texas Lawyer* (June 25, 2012)
- "Commentary: Bad Habits and Rhetorical Sins in Court" *Texas Lawyer* (April 16, 2012)
- "Commentary: Get it Write — Embrace Editing Techniques to Improve Briefs" *Texas Lawyer* (January 23, 2012)
- "Commentary: Board Certification — The Last Big Hurdle" *Texas Lawyer* (August 22, 2011)
- "Pick Me! Persuading the Texas Supreme Court to Grant a Petition for Review" *Texas Lawyer* (March 28, 2011)

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION

- Recognized as a "Local Litigation Star" in the 5th Circuit (Texas) by *Benchmark Appellate* (2013)

INDUSTRIES

Energy
Health Care
Insurance
Oil and Gas
Technology

PRACTICES

Appellate
Commercial Litigation
Health Care Litigation
and Compliance
Litigation and Dispute
Resolution
Products Liability

EDUCATION

JD, 1994, *summa cum laude*, Baylor Law School, *Baylor Law Review*, Lead Articles Editor, National Order of Barristers, Mock Trial Team
Bachelor of Music, 1989, *with distinction*, University of Wisconsin
Supreme Court of Texas, Briefing Attorney for the Honorable Jack Hightower (1994-1995)

ADMISSIONS

Texas 1994
Board Certified - Civil Appeals - Texas Board of Legal Specialization
US Supreme Court
US Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit
US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
US Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit

Kendall M. Gray

- Texas Super Lawyer in Appellate, *Texas Monthly* (2007-2013)
- Texas Rising Star, *Texas Monthly* (2004, 2006)

BRIEFINGS, SEMINARS & SPEECHES

- Speaker, "Bombshells in the Record and Other Ethical Dilemmas for the Appellate Attorney," 23rd Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals, The University of Texas School of Law, Austin, Texas (June 2013)
- TexasBarCLE: "Clarity and Grace: From Ideas to Sentences to Paragraphs" (April 26, 2013)
- Speaker, "United States Supreme Court Update," 22nd Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals, The University of Texas School of Law, Austin, Texas (June 2012)
- Don't Be Ugly: Maximizing Persuasion Through Good Typography and Document Design (March 8, 2012)
- Bills of Review, Restricted Appeals, and Other Appellate Issues (August 11, 2010)

AFFILIATIONS

- Houston Bar Association, Appellate Section
- State Bar of Texas, Appellate Section
- Bar Association of the Fifth Federal Circuit

Board Certified - Civil Appellate Law, Texas Board of Legal Specialization

PRESS RELEASES

- 41 Andrews Kurth Lawyers Named in Texas Super Lawyers 2013 (September 9, 2013)
- Andrews Kurth Receives High Accolades in Litigation and Appellate Practices from Benchmark Litigation (November 7, 2012)
- 35 Andrews Kurth Lawyers Named in Texas Super Lawyers 2012 (September 10, 2012)
- The Appellate Record Chosen as One of the ABA Journal's Blawg 100 (December 6, 2011)
- 35 Andrews Kurth Lawyers Named in Texas Super Lawyers 2011 (September 12, 2011)
- 33 Andrews Kurth Lawyers Named in Texas Super Lawyers 2010 (September 10, 2010)
- 35 Andrews Kurth Lawyers Named in Texas Super Lawyers 2009 (September 16, 2009)
- Thirty-Five Andrews Kurth Partners Named in Texas Super Lawyers 2008 (October 3, 2008)

US Court of Appeals for
the Federal Circuit

US District Court for the
Southern District of
Texas

US District Court for the
Eastern District of Texas

US District Court for the
Northern District of
Texas

US District Court for the
District of Colorado

Synopsis of Texaco's 130 Points of Error

- SEC rule 10b-13 bars private offer to buy shares while your tender offer is pending
- No evidence of tortious interference:
 - ☐ No binding Pennzoil/Getty agreement
 - ☐ No knowing interference
 - ☐ No active inducement
- Improper actual / punitive damages
- Allowing tortious interference to stifle takeovers violates Commerce Clause
- Judges Farris & Caleb were disqualified

Texaco's Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
NAMES OF ALL PARTIES.	i
INDEX OF AUTHORITIES.	xii
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.	1
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.	2
POINTS OF ERROR.	5
OVERVIEW.	58
STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS RELATIVE TO ALL POINTS OF ERROR.	72
A. THE NEGOTIATIONS AMONG PENNZOIL AND THE GETTY ENTITIES.	72
1. Pennzoil Takes Aim At Getty Oil.	72
2. The Memorandum of Agreement.	74
3. The Getty Oil Board Meetings.	76
a. The January 2 Board Meeting.....	76
b. The January 3 Board Meeting.....	79
4. The Press Release.	82
5. Pennzoil's SEC Filing.	84
6. Drafting the Proposed Contract.	85
7. Unresolved Issues.	86
B. GETTY OIL CONTINUES ACTIVELY TO SOLICIT TEXACO TO MAKE A BID.	89
C. THE CALIFORNIA INJUNCTION AND DELAWARE SHAREHOLDER SUIT.	91
D. TEXACO IS TOLD THERE IS NO CONTRACT.	92

E.	PROCEEDINGS BELOW	96
1.	The Genesis of this Case: Pennzoil's Delaware Lawsuit.	96
2.	The Proceedings in the Harris County Trial Court.	98
3.	The Court of Appeals Proceedings....	100
	BRIEF OF THE ARGUMENT.	102
	GROUP I. POINTS OF ERROR: ERRORS REGARDING THE EXISTENCE OF A VALID AND ENFORCEABLE CONTRACT.	102
A.	INTRODUCTION.	102
B.	THE COURT OF APPEALS' DECISION IS INCONSISTENT WITH NEW YORK LAW AND FEDERAL LAW AND VIOLATES THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BECAUSE PENNZOIL'S PURPORTED CONTRACT WAS UNENFORCEABLE AS A MATTER OF FEDERAL LAW.	105
1.	Because the Alleged Contract Violated SEC Rule 10b-13, Pennzoil Had No Right to Assert a Claim For Tortious Interference.	105
2.	Texaco Is Not Precluded From Contending that Pennzoil Has No Right to Assert a Claim for Tortious Interference.	110
3.	There Is No Basis for The Speculation that Pennzoil Could Have Obtained An Exemption or Somehow "Cured" Its Violation.	113
4.	The Court of Appeals' Treatment of Pennzoil's Amended Schedule 14D-1 Underscores Its Fundamental Mis- understanding of the 10b-13 Issue...	119
C.	THE DECISION BELOW VIOLATES THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE.	121

D.	THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRONEOUSLY PERMITTED ENFORCEMENT OF AN ALLEGED CONTRACT THAT WAS UNENFORCEABLE AS A MATTER OF DELAWARE LAW.	123
1.	The Alleged Agreement Was Unen- forceable as a Matter of Delaware Law.	123
2.	The Court of Appeals Erred in Holding That Instruction No. 5 to Special Issue No. 2 Was Proper.	128
GROUP II	POINTS OF ERROR: ERRORS REGARDING CONTRACT FORMATION.	130
A.	THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PENNZOIL AND THE GETTY ENTITIES ENTERED INTO A BINDING AGREEMENT ON JANUARY 3, 1984.	130
1.	Even Agreement on All Terms of a Proposed Contract Is Not A Substitute For a Signed Writing.	130
2.	Substantial and Complex Transactions Normally Require Formal Signed Writings Before Parties Are Bound...	133
3.	Considering the Bargain in Question, Reasonable Minds Must Conclude That a Signed Writing Was Necessary.	134
a.	Reservation of Intent Not to Be Bound	136
b.	Partial Performance.	143
c.	Unresolved Open Terms.	143
d.	Size and Complexity.	145
	Evidence Is No More Than A Scintilla of Evidence.	146
B.	THE COURT OF APPEALS APPLIED THE WRONG STANDARD IN EVALUATING THE FACTUAL SUFFICIENCY OF THE EVIDENCE ON CONTRACT FORMATION.	153

C.	THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN APPROVING THE TRIAL COURT'S JURY CHARGE ON CONTRACT FORMATION.	154
1.	The Court of Appeals Erred in Holding That the Charge Properly Stated New York Law on Contract Formation.	157
a.	The Failure to Ask the Jury Whether There Was a Present Intention to be Bound on All Essential Terms of the Agreement.	159
i.	Failure to define "agreement" or use the term contract..	159
ii.	Failure to ask whether there was agreement on all essential terms.	162
iii.	Failure to instruct the jury as to the requirement of a present intent to be bound	166
b.	The Refusal to Instruct the Jury as to the Factors to be Considered in Determining Whether There Was An Intent to be Bound Short of a Signed Contract.	167
2.	The Court of Appeals Erred in Holding That Pennzoil's Instruc- tions to Special Issue No. 1 Were Proper Under Texas Law.	171
D.	THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN APPROVING THE TRIAL COURT'S ERRONEOUS EVIDENTIARY RULINGS, ADMITTING PENNZOIL'S EVIDENCE, AND EXCLUDING TEXACO'S EVIDENCE RELE- VANT TO THE CONTRACT FORMATION ISSUE.	183
1.	The Copley Notes Should Have Been Excluded	183
2.	Liedtke's Speculations About the Copley Notes Should Have Been Excluded	185

3.	Barrow's Improper Legal Opinion Should Not Have Been Admitted in Evidence	187
4.	The Garber Notes Were Improperly Received	189
5.	Texaco's Evidence Demonstrating Pennzoil's Negotiators' Awareness That The Transaction Violated Rule 10b-13 Was Excluded Improperly.	190
E.	THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN HOLDING THAT THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT FOUND BY THE JURY WERE SUFFICIENTLY DEFINITE TO BE ENFORCEABLE	192
GROUP III POINTS OF ERROR: ERRORS REGARDING TEXACO'S ALLEGED ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF A GETTY/ PENNZOIL CONTRACT.		195
A.	NEW YORK LAW REQUIRES ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONTRACT INTERFERED WITH	198
B.	THERE IS NO REASONABLE BASIS FOR THE COURT OF APPEALS INFERRING THAT TEXACO HAD ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE ALLEGED PENNZOIL-GETTY CONTRACT.	202
1.	It Is Conceded that Pennzoil Relies Upon Facts Not Known to Texaco to Establish Its Contract Case.	203
2.	Texaco was Repeatedly Assured There Was No Contract.	209
3.	Undisputed Evidence Makes Impossible A Reasonable Inference of Actual Knowledge.	210
4.	The Circumstances Relied Upon by the Court of Appeals Have No Inferential Value.	212
5.	No Inference of Actual Knowledge Is Permissible on the Facts of This Case.	222
C.	THE COURT OF APPEALS APPLIED THE WRONG STANDARD IN EVALUATING THE FACTUAL SUFFICIENCY OF THE EVIDENCE ON ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE.	224

D.	PENNZOIL'S LEGALLY ERRONEOUS CHARGE ON TEXACO'S "KNOWING INTERFERENCE" WARRANTS REVERSAL	225
1.	Pennzoil Refused to Ask the Correct Question—Pennzoil Collapsed "Actual Knowledge" and "Intentional Interference," Thereby Submitting A Controlling Question On Neither Issue	225
2.	Instruction No. 2 Imposed a "Duty to Investigate" and Imposed Liability Based on a Should Have Known Standard Contrary to New York Substantive Law	232
3.	The Court of Appeals' Misinterpre- tation of the Requirement of Actual Knowledge	237
4.	Special Issue No. 3 (Damages) Improperly Assumes That Texaco "Knowingly Interfere[ed]" With An Agreement, Thus Suggesting An Affirmative Answer to Special Issue No. 2	248
GROUP IV POINTS OF ERROR: ERRORS REGARDING THE REQUIREMENT OF ACTIVE INDUCEMENT (INTERFERENCE).		251
A.	INSTRUCTIONS NOS. 1 AND 3 TO SPECIAL ISSUE NO. 2 (KNOWING INTERFERENCE) ARE INCORRECT STATEMENTS OF NEW YORK LAW AND CONSTITUTE DIRECT COMMENTS ON THE WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE	251
B.	INSTRUCTION NOS. 4 AND 5 TO SPECIAL ISSUE NO. 2 (KNOWING INTERFERENCE) IMPROPERLY EMPHASIZE PENNZOIL'S EVIDENCE IN RESPONSE TO TEXACO'S DEFENSES, ARE UNNECESSARY TO THE ISSUE PRESENTED, AND CONSTITUTE DIRECT COMMENTS ON THE WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE	254

C.	THERE IS NO BASIS FOR ANY REASONABLE INFERENCE OF ACTIVE INDUCEMENT.	258
D.	THE COURT OF APPEALS APPLIED THE WRONG STANDARD IN EVALUATING THE FACTUAL SUFFICIENCY OF THE EVIDENCE ON ACTIVE INDUCEMENT.	260
GROUP V POINTS OF ERROR: ERRORS REGARDING THE AWARD OF ACTUAL DAMAGES.		261
A.	BECAUSE NEW YORK LAW MEASURES ACTUAL DAMAGES BY THE MARKET VALUE OF WHAT PENNZOIL CLAIMS TO HAVE "LOST," PENNZOIL'S DAMAGES ARE NO MORE THAN \$470 MILLION.	262
B.	PENNZOIL'S DAMAGES PROOF WAS LEGALLY INSUFFICIENT BECAUSE IT DEPENDED ON A CONTINGENCY AND SPECULATIVE FUTURE EVENTS.	266
C.	BECAUSE PENNZOIL WAS AWARDED DAMAGES FOR FUTURE LOSSES, THOSE DAMAGES MUST BE DISCOUNTED TO PRESENT VALUE.	270
D.	THE COURT OF APPEALS APPLIED AN IMPROPER STANDARD OF REVIEW.	273
GROUP VI POINTS OF ERROR: ERRORS REGARDING THE AWARD OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES.		273
A.	BECAUSE NEW YORK LAW REQUIRES PROOF OF ACTUAL MALICE AND ILL WILL, TEXACO'S UNDISPUTED MOTIVE OF FURTHERING ITS OWN ECONOMIC INTERESTS FORBIDS THE IMPOSITION OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES.	274
B.	BECAUSE NEW YORK LAW FORBIDS PUNITIVE DAMAGES WHERE THE DEFENDANT ACTED PURSUANT TO THE ADVICE OF COUNSEL, THE AWARD OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES MUST BE REVERSED.	276
C.	BECAUSE TEXACO DID NOT ENGAGE IN MORALLY CULPABLE CONDUCT AIMED AT THE PUBLIC, PUNITIVE DAMAGES ARE INAPPROPRIATE.	277

D.	THE TRIAL COURT ERRED REFUSING TEXACO'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION L	278
GROUP VII POINTS OF ERROR: ERRORS REGARDING REFUSAL TO GIVE FULL FAITH AND CREDIT TO THE APPLICABLE LAW OF NEW YORK AND DELAWARE.		
		281
A.	THE APPLICATION OF TEXAS PROCEDURAL LAW MAY NOT BE USED TO DENY EFFECT TO CONTROLLING PRINCIPLES OF NEW YORK LAW	282
B.	THE COURTS BELOW MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO REFUSE TO APPLY NEW YORK LAW.	284
GROUP VIII POINTS OF ERROR: ERRORS REGARDING THE SUPREMACY AND COMMERCE CLAUSES.		
		286
A.	THE PENNZOIL RULE VIOLATES THE COMMERCE CLAUSE OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.	286
B.	THE PENNZOIL RULE ALSO VIOLATES THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE BY CONFLICT- ING WITH THE SECURITIES ACTS.	298
C.	THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN HOLDING THAT TEXACO WAIVED ITS ARGUMENT THAT THE LOWER COURT JUDGMENT VIOLATED THE COMMERCE AND SUPREMACY CLAUSES.	302
GROUP IX POINTS OF ERROR: DUE PROCESS AND FAIR TRIAL ERRORS.		
		304
A.	THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED UNDER TEXAS LAW AND THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE IN HOLDING THAT JUDGE FARRIS WAS NOT DISQUALIFIED.	305
1.	The Undisputed Facts.	305
a.	Pennzoil Counsel's Undisclosed Relationship With Judge Farris.	305
b.	The Denial of Texaco's Motion To Recuse or Disqualify Judge Farris.	307

c.	Judge Farris' Undisclosed Animus In Reaction To Texaco's Recusal Motion.	309
d.	Judge Farris' Role As Trial Judge.	312
2.	The Court of Appeals Addressed the Wrong Question.	313
3.	The Court of Appeals Applied The Wrong Legal Standards.	313
a.	The Court of Appeals Erred in Holding That Canon 3C(1) Is Not A Basis For Judicial Disqualification in Texas.	313
b.	The Court of Appeals Applied the Wrong Due Process Test For Judicial Disqualification..	317
4.	Applying Either Canon 3C(1) or the Due Process Test, Judge Farris' Extra-Judicial Relationship With Mr. Jamail Required His Disqualification.	319
5.	Wholly Apart From His Relationship With Mr. Jamail, Judge Farris' Personal Bias Against Texaco and Its Counsel Required His Disqualification Under the Due Process Clause.	322
6.	The Court of Appeals Erred in Refusing To Consider the Evidence of Judge Farris' Anti-Texaco Bias.	325
7.	Judge Farris Played A Sufficiently Pivotal Role To Require A New Trial.	326
B.	THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN HOLDING THAT JUDGE CASSEB'S LATE SUBSTITUTION AND, THE APPLICATION OF TEXAS RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 18 TO THE FACTS OF THIS CASE, DID NOT VIOLATE THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE.	328

1.	Judge Casseb's Late Substitution And The Denial of Texaco's Mistrial Motion	328
2.	Judge Casseb's Late Substitution Violated Due Process.	330
3.	A Mistrial Was Also Required Under Texas Law	338
C.	THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN HOLDING THAT JUDGE CASSEB'S IRRATIONAL REFUSAL TO HEAR OR DECIDE TEXACO'S NEW TRIAL MOTION DID NOT VIOLATE THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE	339
1.	Judge Casseb's Refusal To Hear Or Decide Texaco's New Trial Motion.	339
a.	Texaco's Challenge To Judge Casseb's Qualifications..	339
b.	Judge Casseb's Retaliation For Texaco's Continued Challenge To His Qualifica- tions.	340
2.	Judge Casseb's Refusal To Hear Or Decide Texaco's New Trial Motion Violated Due Process.	342
D.	IT WAS ERROR TO DENY TEXACO A HEARING ON JUDGE CASSEB'S QUALIFICATIONS.	346
	PRAYER FOR RELIEF.	349
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.	352

Texaco's Overview

first time nineteen (19) new cases not previously considered or argued by either party, but refusing to accept a post-argument brief from Texaco thus denying Texaco the right to rebut the new arguments and new cases raised by Pennzoil. (Germane to First Motion for Rehearing Point 17 and Second Motion for Rehearing Point 17) (Order dated August 20, 1986; Texaco's Motion for Reconsideration filed August 22, 1986; Order Denying Texaco's Motion, August 22, 1986)

130. The court of appeals erred under state law and under the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution in refusing to release to Texaco the record of the oral argument before the court. (Germane to First Motion for Rehearing Point 18 and Second Motion for Rehearing Point 18) (Joint Motion of appellant Texaco and appellee Pennzoil to obtain a transcribed copy of oral argument filed August 8, 1986; Order Denying Joint Motion, August 18, 1986)

OVERVIEW

The court of appeals has affirmed a judgment against Texaco on the basis of a claim by Pennzoil that Texaco intentionally induced the Getty entities (the Getty Oil Company and its two largest shareholders, the Getty family trust and Getty Museum) to breach a known, existing and valid "contract" to Pennzoil's detriment of more than seven and a half billion

dollars (\$7,530,000,000.00). At the court of appeals' suggestion, Pennzoil remitted two of the three billion dollar (\$3,000,000,000.00) punitive damage award, still leaving a punitive damages judgment against Texaco for one billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000.00). The resulting total judgment (including the accrued post-judgment interest) exceeds one half of the budget for the entire State of Texas for the current fiscal year.¹ The post-judgment interest on this judgment works out to more than one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000.00) per hour.

Pennzoil's "compensatory" damage award of 7.53 billion dollars (\$7,530,000,000.00) is more than twice what Pennzoil was willing to pay for the rights it claims it "contracted" to purchase--and more than 15 times the difference between the highest established market value of those rights and Pennzoil's alleged contract price. Not only did Pennzoil never pay one cent to Getty for this windfall, but Pennzoil made a profit of nearly thirty-four million dollars (\$34,000,000.00) from Texaco's purchase of the Getty Oil stock Pennzoil had bought a month or two before Texaco's offer. Pennzoil "generously" permitted its profits to be offset against its outrageous damage recovery.

How can such a judgment be justified? Frankly, this egregiously unjust result cannot be legally justified. It can, however, be explained--and that is the office of Texaco's

1. Texas Almanac, State Budget, 69th Legislature, Sept. 1, 1986 -Aug. 31, 1987, p. 718 (\$18,309,566,711.00).

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: Extreme Brief Makeover

Also available as part of the eCourse

[Appellate Practice: Oral Arguments, Extreme Brief Makeover, Effective Prayers, and Persuasive Writing and Arguments](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
24th Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals session
"Extreme Brief Makeover"