

PRESENTED AT

10th Annual Advanced Texas Administrative Law Seminar

August 31 – September 1, 2015
Austin, Texas

Supreme Court of Texas Update

Hon. Jeffrey S. Boyd

SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS UPDATE

Phil Johnson
Justice
Supreme Court of Texas

Heather Holmes
Staff Attorney

Robert Brailas
Staff Attorney

Kayla Frank
Law Clerk

Ryan Rieger
Law Clerk

Georgie Gonzales
Executive Assistant

**Special thanks to all the Staff Attorneys and
Law Clerks at the Supreme Court of Texas
for their substantial contributions.**

July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SCOPE OF THIS ARTICLE	1
II. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW	1
A. Agency Review of Administrative Decisions	1
1. <u>Thompson v. Tex. Dep’t of Licensing & Regulation</u> , 455 S.W.3d 569 (Tex. December 19, 2014) [13-0686].....	1
B. Judicial Review	1
1. <u>Klumb v. Hous. Mun. Emps. Pension Sys.</u> , 458 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. March 20, 2015) [13-0515].....	1
C. Public Information Act	2
1. <u>Boeing Co. v. Paxton</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1246 (Tex. June 19, 2015) [12-1007].....	2
2. <u>Greater Hous. P’ship v. City of Hous.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1362 (Tex. June 26, 2015) [13-0745].....	3
D. Texas Water Code	3
1. <u>Sw. Bell Tel., L.P. v. Emmett</u> , 459 S.W.3d 578 (Tex. March 20, 2015) [13-0584].....	3
III. ARBITRATION	4
A. Enforcement of Arbitration Agreement	4
1. <u>Fredericksburg Care Co. v. Lira</u> , 461 S.W.3d 529 (Tex. March 6, 2015) [13-0577].....	4
2. <u>Fredericksburg Care Co. v. Perez</u> , 461 S.W.3d 513 (Tex. March 6, 2015) [13-0573].....	4
3. <u>G.T. Leach Builders, L.L.C. v. Sapphire V.P., L.P.</u> , 458 S.W.3d 502 (Tex. March 20, 2015) [13-0497].....	5
4. <u>Williamsburg Care Co. v. Acosta</u> , 461 S.W.3d 530 (Tex. March 6, 2015) [13-0576].....	5
B. Waiver	6
1. <u>Richmont Holdings, Inc. v. Superior Recharge Systems, L.L.C.</u> , 455 S.W.3d 573 (Tex. December 19, 2014) [13-0907].....	6
IV. ATTORNEYS	6
A. Disciplinary Proceedings	6
1. <u>In re State Bar of Tex.</u> , 440 S.W.3d 621 (Tex. August 22, 2014) [13-0161].....	6
B. Disqualification	7
1. <u>In re RSR Corp.</u> , 405 S.W.3d 265 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2013), <i>argument granted on pet. for writ of mandamus</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 47 (October 24, 2014) [13-0499].....	7
C. Fees Agreement	7
1. <u>Royston, Rayzor, Vickery, & Williams, LLP v. Lopez</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1422 (Tex. June 26, 2015) [13-1026].....	7
2. <u>Wells Fargo, N. A. v. Murphy</u> , 458 S.W.3d 912 (Tex. February 6, 2015) [13-0236].....	8
D. Immunity Doctrine	8
1. <u>Cantey Hanger, LLP v. Byrd</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1400 (Tex. June 26, 2015) [13-0861].....	8
V. CLASS ACTIONS	9
A. Unclaimed Distributions	9
1. <u>Highland Homes Ltd. v. State</u> , 448 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [12-0604].....	9

VI. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW	10
A. Due Course	10
1. <u>Patel v. Tex. Dep’t Licensing & Regulation</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1298 (Tex. June 26, 2015) [12-0657].....	10
B. First Amendment Speech	12
1. <u>Burbage v. Burbage</u> , 447 S.W.3d 249 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [12-0563].....	12
2. <u>Kinney v. Barnes</u> , 443 S.W.3d 87 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [13-0043].....	12
C. Home Equity Loans	13
1. <u>Garofolo v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC</u> , <i>certified question accepted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1203 (June 19, 2015) [15-0437].....	13
D. Retroactivity	13
1. <u>Union Carbide Corp. v. Synatzske</u> , 438 S.W.3d 39 (Tex. July 3, 2014) [12-0617].....	13
E. Sanctions	14
1. <u>Nath v. Tex. Children’s Hosp.</u> , 446 S.W.3d 355 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [12-0620].....	14
F. Takings	15
1. <u>City of Hous. v. Carlson</u> , 451 S.W.3d 828 (Tex. December 19, 2014) [13-0435].....	15
2. <u>Porretto v. Tex. Gen. Land Office</u> , 448 S.W.3d 393 (Tex. July 3, 2014) [12-0483].....	15
3. <u>State v. Clear Channel Outdoor, Inc.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 663 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-0053].....	16
VII. CONTRACTS	17
A. Damages	17
1. <u>Phillips v. Carlton Energy Grp.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 803 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [12-0255].....	17
B. Economic Loss Rule	18
1. <u>Chapman Custom Homes, Inc. v. Dallas Plumbing Co.</u> , 445 S.W.3d 716 (Tex. August 22, 2014) [13-0776].....	18
C. Fraudulent Inducement	18
1. <u>Ford Motor Co. v. Castillo</u> , 444 S.W.3d 616 (Tex. October 3, 2014) [13-0158].....	18
2. <u>Nat’l Prop. Holdings, L.P. v. Westergren</u> , 453 S.W.3d 419 (Tex. January 9, 2015) [13-0801].....	19
D. Interpretation	20
1. <u>El Paso Mktg., L.P. v. Wolf Hollow I, L.P.</u> , 450 S.W.3d 121 (Tex. November 21, 2014) [13-0816].....	20
2. <u>Plains Exploration & Prod. Co. v. Torch Energy Advisors, Inc.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1115 (Tex. June 12, 2015) [13-0597].....	20
VIII. CORPORATIONS	21
A. Shareholder Derivative Actions	21
1. <u>Sneed v. Webre</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1009 (Tex. May 29, 2015) [12-0045].....	21
IX. DAMAGES	22
A. Injuries To Real Property	22
1. <u>Gilbert Wheeler, Inc. v. Enbridge Pipelines (E. Tex.), L.P.</u> , 449 S.W.3d 474 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [13-0234].....	22
2. <u>Hous. Unlimited, Inc. Metal Processing v. Mel Acres Ranch</u> , 443 S.W.3d 820 (Tex. August 22, 2014) [13-0084].....	23

B. Punitive Damages.	23
1. <u>Zorrilla v. Aypco Constr. II, LLC</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1140 (Tex. June 12, 2015) [14-0067]..	23
X. DISABILITY ACCOMMODATIONS.	24
A. Prison Facilities.	24
1. <u>Beeman v. Livingston</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1414 (Tex. June 26, 2015) [13-0867]..	24
XI. ELECTIONS.	24
A. Ballot Sufficiency.	24
1. <u>Dacus v. Parker</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1076 (Tex. June 12, 2015) [13-0047]..	24
XII. EMPLOYMENT LAW.	25
A. Duty to Maintain Safe Workplace.	25
1. <u>Austin v. Kroger Tex. L.P.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1154 (Tex. June 12, 2015) [14-0216]..	25
B. Employment Discrimination.	25
1. <u>San Antonio Water Sys. v. Nicholas</u> , 461 S.W.3d 131 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-0966]..	25
C. Whistleblower Actions.	26
1. <u>Tex. Comm’n on Env’tl. Quality v. Resendez</u> , 450 S.W.3d 520 (Tex. November 21, 2014) [13-0094]..	26
2. <u>Tex. Dep’t of Human Servs. v. Okoli</u> , 440 S.W.3d 611 (Tex. August 22, 2014) [10-0567]..	26
XIII. EVIDENCE.	27
A. Expert Testimony.	27
1. <u>Gharda USA, Inc. v. Control Solutions, Inc.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 821 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [12-0987]..	27
2. <u>JLG Trucking, LLC v. Garza</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 726 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-0978]..	27
B. Spoliation.	28
1. <u>Brookshire Bros. v. Aldridge</u> , 438 S.W.3d 9 (Tex. July 3, 2014) [10-0846]..	28
2. <u>Wackenhut Corp. v. Gutierrez</u> , 453 S.W.3d 917 (Tex. February 6, 2015) [12-0136]..	29
XIV. FAMILY LAW.	29
A. Child Support.	29
1. <u>In re Office of the Attorney Gen. of Tex.</u> , 456 S.W.3d 153 (Tex. January 30, 2015) [14-0038]..	29
B. Termination of Parental Rights.	30
1. <u>In re K.M.L.</u> , 443 S.W.3d 101 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [12-0728]..	30
XV. GOVERNMENTAL IMMUNITY.	30
A. Contract Claims.	30
1. <u>Damuth v. Trinity Valley Cmty. Coll.</u> , 450 S.W.3d 903 (Tex. November 21, 2014) [13-0815]..	30
2. <u>Lubbock Cnty. Water Control & Improvement Dist. v. Church & Akin, L.L.C.</u> , 442 S.W.3d 297 (Tex. July 3, 2014) [12-1039]..	31

3. <u>Zachry Constr. Corp. v. Port of Hous. Auth. of Harris Cnty.</u> , 449 S.W.3d 98 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [12-0772].....	31
B. Derivative Immunity	32
1. <u>Brown & Gay Eng’g, Inc. v. Olivares</u> , 461 S.W.3d 117 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-0605].....	32
C. Recreational Use Statute	33
1. <u>Suarez v. City of Tex. City</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1259 (Tex. June 19, 2015) [13-0947].....	33
2. <u>Univ. of Tex. at Arlington v. Williams</u> , 459 S.W.3d 48 (Tex. March 20, 2015) [13-0338].....	34
D. Texas Tort Claims Act	35
1. <u>Molina v. Alvarado</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 942 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [14-0536].....	35
2. <u>Ryder Integrated Logistics, Inc. v. Fayette Cnty.</u> , 453 S.W.3d 922 (February 6, 2015) [13-0968].....	35
3. <u>Tex. Dep’t of Aging & Disability Servs. v. Cannon</u> , 453 S.W.3d 411 (Tex. January 9, 2015) [12-0830].....	36
XVI. INSURANCE	36
A. Duty to Defend	36
1. <u>McGinnes Indus. Maint. Corp. v. Phoenix Ins. Co.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1439 (Tex. June 26, 2015) [14-0465].....	36
2. <u>Seger v. Yorkshire Ins. Co.</u> , 407 S.W.3d 435 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2013), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 476 (March 13, 2015) [13-0673].....	37
B. Duty to Indemnify	37
1. <u>In re Essex Ins. Co.</u> , 450 S.W.3d 524 (Tex. November 21, 2014) [13-1006].....	37
C. Policies/Coverage	38
1. <u>Greene v. Farmers Ins. Exch.</u> , 446 S.W.3d 761 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [12-0867].....	38
2. <u>J&D Towing, LLC v. Am. Alt. Ins. Corp.</u> , 446 S.W.3d 41 (Tex. App.—Waco 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 754 (May 1, 2015) [14-0574].....	39
3. <u>JAW The Pointe, L.L.C. v. Lexington Ins. Co.</u> , 460 S.W.3d 597 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-0711].....	39
4. <u>RSUI Indem. Co. v. The Lynd Co.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 854 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [13-0080].....	40
XVII. INTENTIONAL TORTS	40
A. Defamation	40
1. <u>Shell Oil Co. v. Writt</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 956 (Tex. May 15, 2015) [13-0552].....	40
XVIII. JURISDICTION	41
A. Mandamus	41
1. <u>In re Dow</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1457 (Tex. June 26, 2015) [15-0205].....	41
B. Personal Jurisdiction	42
1. <u>TV Azteca v. Ruiz</u> , 2014 WL 346031 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 227 (January 30, 2015) [14-0186].....	42
C. Subject Matter Jurisdiction	42
1. <u>Kallinen v. City of Hous.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 576 (Tex. March 20, 2015) [14-0015].....	42

XIX. MEDICAL LIABILITY	43
A. Expert Reports	43
1. <u>Hebner v. Reddy</u> , 453 S.W.3d 323 (Tex. App.—Austin 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1047 (June 12, 2015) [14-0593].....	43
2. <u>Van Ness v. ETMC First Physicians</u> , 461 S.W.3d 140 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [14-0353].....	43
B. Health Care Liability Claims	44
1. <u>CHRISTUS Health Gulf Coast v. Carswell</u> , 433 S.W.3d 585 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2013), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1046 (June 12, 2015) [14-0362].....	44
2. <u>Ross v. St. Luke’s Episcopal Hosp.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 766 (Tex. May 1, 2015) [13-0439].....	44
C. Health Care Providers	45
1. <u>Randol Mill Pharmacy v. Miller</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 733 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-1014].....	45
D. Statute of Repose	45
1. <u>Tenet Hosps. Ltd. v. Rivera</u> , 445 S.W.3d 698 (Tex. August 22, 2014) [13-0096]..	45
XX. MUNICIPAL LAW	46
A. State Law Preemption	46
1. <u>BCCA Appeal Grp., Inc. v. City of Hous.</u> , 2013 WL 4680224 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2013), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 369 (February 20, 2015) [13-0768].....	46
B. Zoning	46
1. <u>City of Dallas v. TCI W. End, Inc.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 888 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [13-0795].....	46
XXI. NEGLIGENCE	47
A. Independent Contractors	47
1. <u>Abutahoun v. Dow Chem. Co.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 879 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [13-0175].....	47
B. Motor Carriers	47
1. <u>Gonzalez v. Ramirez</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 903 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [14-0107].....	47
C. Premises Liability	48
1. <u>Henkel v. Norman</u> , 441 S.W.3d 249 (Tex. August 22, 2014) [13-0712].....	48
D. Seat Belt Use	48
1. <u>Nabors Well Servs., Ltd. v. Loera</u> , 457 S.W.3d 435 (Tex. March 20, 2015) [13-0126].....	48
2. <u>Nabors Well Servs., Ltd. v. Romero</u> , 456 S.W.3d 553 (Tex. February 13, 2015) [13-0136].....	49
E. Statute of Repose	49
1. <u>Occidental Chem. Corp. v. Jenkins</u> , 415 S.W.3d 14 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2013), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 477 (March 13, 2015) [13-0961].....	49
XXII. OIL AND GAS	50
A. Contract Interpretation	50
1. <u>Kachina Pipeline Co., Inc. v. Lillis</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1105 (Tex. June 12, 2015) [13-0596].....	50

B. Duty of Utmost Good Faith.	51
1. <u>KCM Fin., L.L.C. v. Bradshaw</u> , 457 S.W.3d 70 (Tex. March 6, 2015) [13-0199]..	51
C. Royalty Payments.	52
1. <u>Chesapeake Exploration, L.L.C. v. Hyder</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1182 (Tex. June 12, 2015) [14-0302]..	52
2. <u>Hooks v. Samson Lone Star, Ltd. P’ship</u> , 457 S.W.3d 52 (Tex. January 30, 2015 [12-0920]..	52
XXIII. PROCEDURE—APPELLATE.	53
A. Intervention on Appeal.	53
1. <u>State v. Naylor</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1216 (Tex. June 19, 2015) [11-0114, 11-0222]..	53
B. Jurisdiction.	54
1. <u>William Marsh Rice Univ. v. Refaey</u> , 459 S.W.3d 590 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [14-0048]..	54
C. Record Evidence.	54
1. <u>Vernco Constr., Inc. v. Nelson</u> , 460 S.W.3d 145 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-0750]..	54
D. Supersedeas.	55
1. <u>In re Longview Energy Co.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 934 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [14-0175]..	55
E. Suspension of Judgment.	55
1. <u>In re Corral-Lerma</u> , 451 S.W.3d 385 (Tex. November 21, 2014) [12-0485]..	55
2. <u>In re State Bd. for Educator Certification</u> , 452 S.W.3d 802 (Tex. December 19, 2014) [13-0537]..	56
XXIV. PROCEDURE—PRETRIAL.	56
A. Choice of Law.	56
1. <u>ExxonMobil Corp. v. Drennen</u> , 452 S.W.3d 319 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [12-6021]..	56
B. Discovery.	57
1. <u>In re Mem’l Hosp. Sys.</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 975 (Tex. May 22, 2015) [14-0171]..	57
2. <u>In re Nat’l Lloyds Ins. Co.</u> , 449 S.W.3d 486 (Tex. October 31, 2014) [13-0761]..	57
C. Dismissal.	58
1. <u>Jaster v. Comet II Constr., Inc.</u> , 438 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. July 3, 2014) [12-0804]..	58
D. Dismissal for Want of Prosecution.	58
1. <u>In re Conner</u> , 458 S.W.3d 532 (Tex. March 20, 2015) [14-0177]..	58
E. Forum Non Conveniens.	59
1. <u>In re Bridgestone Am. Tire Operations, LLC</u> , 459 S.W.3d 565 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [12-0946]..	59
2. <u>In re Ford Motor Co.</u> , 442 S.W.3d 265 (Tex. July 3, 2014) [12-0957]..	60
F. Pre-Suit Discovery.	60
1. <u>In re Doe</u> , 444 S.W.3d 603 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [13-0073]..	60
G. Sanctions.	61
1. <u>Petroleum Solutions, Inc. v. Head</u> , 454 S.W.3d 482 (Tex. December 19, 2014) [11-0425]..	61
H. Statute of Limitations.	62
1. <u>Am. Star Energy & Minerals Corp. v. Stowers</u> , 457 S.W.3d 427 (Tex. February 27, 2015) [13-0484]..	62

XXV. PROCEDURE—TRIAL AND POST-TRIAL	63
A. Bill of Review	63
1. <u>Pike-Grant v. Grant</u> , 447 S.W.3d 884 (Tex. October 3, 2014) [13-0277].....	63
2. <u>Valdez v. Hollenbeck</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1129 (Tex. June 12, 2015) [13-0709].....	63
B. Costs	64
1. <u>Campbell v. Wilder</u> , 430 S.W.3d 474 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth, 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1203 (June 19, 2015) [14-0379].....	64
C. Enforcement of Judgments	64
D. Finality of Judgments	64
1. <u>Farm Bureau Cnty. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Rogers</u> , 455 S.W.3d 161 (Tex. January 30, 2015) [14-0279].....	64
2. <u>Ventling v. Johnson</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 892 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [14-0095].....	65
E. Juror Disqualification	66
1. <u>In re M.G.N.</u> , 441 S.W.3d 246 (Tex. August 22, 2014) [13-0409].....	66
F. Jury Instructions and Questions	66
1. <u>King Fisher Marine Serv., L.P. v. Tamez</u> , 443 S.W.3d 838 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [13-0103].....	66
2. <u>R.R. Comm’n of Tex. v. Gulf Energy Exploration Corp.</u> , 2014 WL 3107507 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1047 (June 12, 2015) [14-0534].....	67
XXVI. PRODUCTS LIABILITY	67
A. Causation	67
1. <u>Bostic v. Georgia-Pacific Corp.</u> , 439 S.W.3d 332 (Tex. July 11, 2014) [10-0775].....	67
B. Design Defects	68
1. <u>Genie Indus. v. Matak</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 832 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [13-0042].....	68
XXVII. REAL PROPERTY	68
A. Deeds	68
1. <u>Cosgrove v. Cade</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1432 (Tex. June 26, 2015) [14-0346].....	68
2. <u>Stribling v. Millican DPC Partners, LP</u> , 458 S.W.3d 17 (Tex. March 20, 2015) [14-0500].....	69
B. Easements	69
1. <u>Hamrick v. Ward</u> , 446 S.W.3d 377 (Tex. August 29, 2014) [12-0348].....	69
C. Eminent Domain	70
1. <u>Caffe Ribs, Inc. v. State</u> , 2014 WL 198312 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1066 (June 12, 2015) [14-0193].....	70
D. Foreclosure	71
1. <u>PlainsCapital Bank v. Martin</u> , 459 S.W.3d 550 (Tex. March 27, 2015) [13-0337].....	71
E. Inverse Condemnation	72
1. <u>Harris Cnty. Flood Control Dist. v. Kerr</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1085 (Tex. June 12, 2015) [13-0303].....	72
F. Trespass	72
1. <u>Envtl. Processing Sys., L.C. v. FPL Farming, Ltd.</u> , 457 S.W.3d 414 (Tex. February 6, 2015) [12-0905].....	72

XXVIII. SECURITIES	73
A. Investment Contracts	73
1. <u>Life Partners, Inc. v. Arnold</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 911 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [14-0122 & 14-0226].....	73
XXIX. TAXES	74
A. Property Taxes	74
1. <u>Tex. Student Housing Auth. v. Brazos Cnty. Appraisal Dist.</u> , 460 S.W.3d 137 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-0593].....	74
XXX. TEXAS CITIZENS PARTICIPATION ACT	74
A. Dismissal Standard	74
1. <u>Andrews Cnty. v. Sierra Club</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 941 (Tex. May 8, 2015) [14-0214].....	74
2. <u>In re Lipsky</u> , 460 S.W.3d 579 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-0928].....	75
3. <u>KBMT Operating Co. v. Toledo</u> , 434 S.W.3d 276 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 477 (March 13, 2015) [14-0456].....	75
4. <u>Lippincott v. Whisenhunt</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 705 (Tex. April 24, 2015) [13-0926].....	76
XXXI. WORKERS’ COMPENSATION	76
A. Course and Scope of Employment	76
1. <u>SeaBright Ins. Co. v. Lopez</u> , S.W.3d , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1172 (Tex. June 12, 2015) [14-0272].....	76
B. Exclusive Remedy Provision	77
1. <u>In re Crawford & Co.</u> , 458 S.W.3d 920 (Tex. February 27, 2014) [14-0256].....	77
C. Retaliation	77
1. <u>Kingsaire, Inc. v. Melendez</u> , 416 S.W.3d 898 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2013), <i>pet. granted</i> , 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 754 (May 1, 2015) [14-0006].....	77

SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS UPDATE

Phil Johnson
Justice
Supreme Court of Texas

I. SCOPE OF THIS ARTICLE

This article surveys cases that were decided by the Supreme Court of Texas from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. Petitions granted during that time but not yet decided are also included.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

A. Agency Review of Administrative Decisions

1. Thompson v. Tex. Dep't of Licensing & Regulation, 455 S.W.3d 569 (Tex. December 19, 2014) [13-0686].

At issue in this case was whether the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation correctly applied a statute when revising an administrative law judge's finding that an occupational license applicant should receive a license. John Thompson applied for a tow truck operator's license after he was released from military prison. The Department issued a proposed denial of Thompson's application based upon his conviction. Thompson received a hearing in front of an administrative law judge, who weighed the evidence and found Thompson to be rehabilitated as required by Texas Occupations Code Section 53.023(a)(5). The Department, in turn, revised the administrative law judge's findings of fact and conclusions of law to modify its proposed denial of Thompson's application. Specifically, the Department disagreed with the administrative law judge's finding that Thompson was rehabilitated, instead deciding that Thompson's failure to admit to the crime for which he was convicted precluded him from being rehabilitated.

The trial court reversed the Department's denial on the grounds that the alteration of the findings of fact and conclusions of law was unlawful. The court of appeals reversed the trial court's judgment to uphold the Department's original decision, finding that the Department sufficiently justified the alteration.

The Supreme Court reversed the court of appeals' judgment, holding that the Department

wrongly applied the statutory definition of "rehabilitation" in denying Thompson's application. The Department's requirement that a convict formally confess to the crime in order to be rehabilitated is unsupported by the relevant sections of the Texas Occupations Code or the plain meaning of the term. Because the Department misinterpreted an unambiguous statute, its reading was not entitled to deference.

B. Judicial Review

1. Klumb v. Hous. Mun. Emps. Pension Sys., 458 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. March 20, 2015) [13-0515].

The dispute in this case arises from a determination by the Houston Municipal Employees Pension System that municipal employees who were transferred to a non-profit corporation remained city employees for pension-fund purposes. A board of trustees has exclusive authority to determine all legal and factual questions pertaining to administration of the pension fund and eligibility for membership, service, and benefits. The overriding issue in the case was whether the challenged determination resulted from a permissible interpretation or an impermissible alteration of the statute.

In connection with broader cost-saving measures, the City of Houston formulated a plan to remove a division of employees from the pension system by outsourcing municipal services and related employees to a local government corporation (LGC) that was governed by a board selected by City officials and partially funded by City taxes. The pension board determined that the transferred employees remained under the City's effective control and payroll and therefore fell within the ambit of the statutory definition of "employee," which determines an individual's status as a pension-fund member. In response, the City created a non-profit corporation that would employ the affected employees and lease them to the LGC for the provision of outsourced

municipal services. Once again, the pension board determined that the employees remained pension-system members. Pension plan documents were accordingly amended to reflect that the statutory term “employee” included full-time employees in a City-controlled LGC as well as “any entity controlled, directly or indirectly” by the City.

Several pension-fund members claimed that a separation from municipal service had occurred and, as a result, they were entitled to either begin receiving pension benefits or to defer retirement and cease making mandatory contributions to the pension fund. They sued the pension system and several pension board members, asserting that the pension board’s actions were *ultra vires* and violated their equal protection and due course of law rights. The City intervened, aligning itself with the plaintiffs. Considering the pension system and pension board members’ plea to the jurisdiction, the trial court found jurisdiction to be lacking. The court of appeals affirmed based on the statutory judicial-review bar and the facial invalidity of the plaintiffs’ constitutional claims.

The Supreme Court affirmed, holding that (1) the pension board acted within the scope of its broad statutory authority in construing the term “employee” and (2) the individual petitioners failed to assert viable constitutional claims. Assuming without deciding that the *ultra vires* doctrine is an exception to the statutory ban on judicial review, the Court observed that the pension system’s enabling statute imbues the pension board with unquestionably broad authority to construe the statute, add language deemed necessary, and determine all eligibility issues. Courts may not review the board’s actions in doing so absent a manifest conflict with express statutory terms. The Court determined that no such circumstances were presented here because (1) the statutory definition of “employee” is composed of essential terms that are undefined and (2) the supplemental language the board adopted to articulate its construction of the term “employee” neither inherently nor patently conflicts with the statute. To the extent the pension-fund members and the City alleged that the board’s actions violated a statutorily authorized agreement between the pension system and the City, such a claim was a breach of contract claim, not an *ultra vires* claim.

The constitutional claims were likewise insufficient to overcome the statutory prohibition on judicial review and sovereign immunity. Even assuming the pension board had treated similarly situated employees differently on prior occasions, the board’s actions were rationally related to at least two legitimate government objectives promoted by the challenged classification: (1) preserving sources of pension funding that are adequate to meet demands on the fund, and (2) reducing “double dipping” by those under the nominal employment of a third party but who receive salaries and 401(k) contributions originating in dollar-for-dollar reimbursements paid by the City-controlled and tax-funded LGC. The due-course-of-law claims failed due to the absence of a vested right in retirement benefits and pension-fund contributions.

C. Public Information Act

1. Boeing Co. v. Paxton, S.W.3d ___, 58 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1246 (Tex. June 19, 2015) [12-1007].

This appeal concerns one of the exceptions to disclosure under the Texas Public Information Act. The Act generally gives the public the right to access information the government collects. However, the Act excepts from disclosure information “that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” TEX. GOV’T CODE § 552.104. In 1998, The Boeing Company signed a lease with the Port Authority of San Antonio to lease 1.3 million square feet at Kelly Air Force Base for a term of twenty years. Several years after signing the Kelly lease, a former Boeing employee, Robert Silvas, submitted a Public Information Act request to the Port for various Boeing corporate information, including the lease. The Port notified Boeing of the request and its right to seek relief from the Attorney General. Boeing provided a redacted version of the lease to Silvas and filed objections with the Attorney General as to the redacted parts. Boeing asserted that the withheld information is competitively sensitive information regarding its overhead costs at Kelly that would give an advantage to its competitors. The Attorney General, determined the Section 552.104 exception protects the purchasing interests of a governmental body when conducting competitive bidding, but not those of a private party that

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: Supreme Court of Texas Update: July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2015 Admin Law Judicial Panel and SOAH Judicial Panel](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the 10th Annual Advanced Texas Administrative Law Seminar session "Judicial Panel"