Karen Precella **Haynes and Boone, LLP**Fort Worth, Texas

DISCOVERY UPDATE

Overview

- Format of paper
- Common discovery issues reviewed by ordinary appeal
- Common discovery issues reviewed by mandamus

Discovery issues on ordinary appeal (Rule 190.3-.4)

- Adequate time for discovery—noevidence motion for summary judgment
 - Inadequate. Payne v. J. Baker Corp. (Fort Worth 2013).
 - Adequate. Sloan v. Hill (Houston [1st.] 2013).

Discovery issues on ordinary appeal (Rule 193.6)

- Admission/Exclusion of Evidence failure to respond
 - Admission. Holland v. Friedman & Feiger (Dallas 2014); Bank of Am., N.A. v. Barth (Corpus Christi 2013).
 - Exclusion. In re T.K.D-H. (San Antonio 2014); In re Commitment of Stevenson (Beaumont 2013).

Discovery issues on ordinary appeal (Rule 193.6)

- Admission/Exclusion of Evidence failure to respond
 - Additional discovery on remand. *Safeco Surety v. J.P. S.W. Concrete, Inc.* (Houston [1st] 2013).
 - **Burden.** *Richard v. Towery* (Houston [1st.] 2013).

Discovery issues on ordinary appeal (Rule 194.1-.2)

- Disclosures
 - **Sufficient.** *Kim v. Sanchez* (Fort Worth 2014; *City of Laredo v. Limon* (San Antonio 2013).
 - Deficient/Exclusion. Bailey v. Respironics, Inc. (Dallas 2014); Massey v. Allen Nat'l Prop., LLC (Fort Worth 2013)





Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the <u>UT Law CLE eLibrary (utcle.org/elibrary)</u>

Title search: Discovery Update

Also available as part of the eCourse

Appellate Evidence Update: Expert Testimony Update; Discovery Update for Appellate Lawyers; Evidence Challenge; plus Texas Civil Procedural Update

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the 25th Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals session "Discovery Update for Appellate Lawyers"