

**THE TEXAS ANTI-SLAPP LAW: TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE CH. 27 -
AND THE MULLIGAN LAW – THE DEFAMATION MITIGATION ACT
WHAT REMAINS OF TEXAS REPUTATIONAL TORTS?**

Mark C. Walker

**Dykema Cox Smith
221 N. Kansas, Suite 2000
El Paso, Texas 79901
mwalker@dykema.com
Telephone: (915) 541-9322**

**University of Texas School of Law
40th Annual Page Keeton Civil Litigation Conference
October 27 – 28, 2016
Austin, TX**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | i |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | iv |
| I. Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. The Texas Citizens Participation Act: What Is It?..... | 2 |
| A. Background and Enactment of the TCPA..... | 2 |
| 1. What is a SLAPP lawsuit? | 2 |
| 2. Stated Purpose: Prevent Frivolous Suits | 3 |
| 3. A Solution in Search of a Problem: Underlying Purpose is the Protection of Media Defendants | 5 |
| 4. The 2013 Amendments: Still Media-Driven. | 8 |
| III. Application of the TCPA. | 10 |
| A. What legal actions are covered? | 10 |
| B. What speech rights are protected? | 12 |
| C. Public or Private? Does it matter where the speech is communicated? | 12 |
| D. What is a "matter of public concern?" | 13 |
| E. What are the rights of petition and assembly protected? | 16 |
| F. Exceptions to the TCPA..... | 19 |
| G. Procedure. | 21 |
| 1. A New Form of Dispositive Motion | 21 |
| 2. Deadline to File the Motion - 60 days | 22 |
| 3. Deadline for Hearing and Decision: "Set," "Rule," and Continuances..... | 22 |
| 4. Discovery Stay - But Limited Discovery for "Good Cause" | 24 |
| H. Standards and Burdens of Proof/Actions by Court..... | 26 |
| 1. What evidence may be considered?..... | 26 |
| 2. Burden of Proof on the Movant. | 27 |
| 3. Burden of Proof on the Respondent..... | 28 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| i. | “Clear and specific evidence” - a measure of quality of proof | 28 |
| ii. | What is a "prima facie case, and does it allow for inferences?" | 29 |
| iii. | What about circumstantial evidence? | 31 |
| iv. | If the TCPA was meant to be a higher standard of proof than "preponderance of the evidence," it could violate the Open Courts provision of the Texas Constitution | 33 |
| v. | What about non-communication or "mixed" claims joined in the same lawsuit? | 35 |
| 4. | Affirmative Defenses Are Now Considered Ground for a Ch. 27 Motion to Dismiss, and Assessment of Fees and Sanction..... | 36 |
| 5. | Ruling by the Court - Dismissal Mandatory | 37 |
| 6. | Request for Ch. 27 Sanctions May Survive Nonsuit | 37 |
| I. | Mandatory, Not Discretionary, Award of Fees and Sanctions for Movant Upon Dismissal of Legal Action | 38 |
| J. | Award of Fees, Not Sanctions, for Respondent/Plaintiff – Predicated on Frivolous Motion..... | 40 |
| K. | Appellate Review | 40 |
| 1. | Interlocutory Appeal: What is Reviewable?..... | 40 |
| i. | Denial of motion to dismiss by operation of law: interlocutory appeal is clearly available | 41 |
| ii. | Timely written denial of motion to dismiss — an interlocutory appeal is available for any order that "denies a motion to dismiss" filed under Section 27.003 | 41 |
| a. | Cases finding no jurisdiction to hear interlocutory appeal from untimely written order denying motion to dismiss | 41 |
| b. | Cases finding there is jurisdiction to hear interlocutory appeal from untimely written order denying motion to dismiss | 42 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| iii. | Mandamus..... | 43 |
| 2. | Motion to Dismiss Timely Granted | 45 |
| i. | May be appealable noninterlocutory order | 45 |
| ii. | May be appealable interlocutory order | 45 |
| 3. | Deadlines for Chapter 27 Appeal or Writ | 46 |
| 4. | Any Appeal or Writ From An Order On A Chapter 27 Motion to Dismiss Shall be Expedited..... | 47 |
| 5. | Standard of Review of Interlocutory Appeal | 47 |
| i. | De novo review - statutory construction | 48 |
| ii. | Legal sufficiency review | 49 |
| iii. | Factual sufficiency review | 50 |
| L. | Does the TCPA Apply in Federal Court? | 50 |
| M. | Does the Act Conflict with the Supreme Court’s Rule-Making Authority? | 53 |
| N. | Does the Statute Conflict With Texas’ Constitutional Protection of Rights to Sue for Reputational Torts?..... | 54 |
| IV. | Unintended Consequences | 57 |
| A. | Overbroad Application and Chilling Effect on Meritorious Business Tort Actions | 57 |
| B. | Justice Delayed is Justice Denied. | 59 |
| C. | When The Texas Attorney General Must Be Invited to the Party..... | 59 |
| V. | The TCPA - Conclusions Drawn..... | 60 |
| VI. | The “Mulligan Bill”: The Texas Defamation Mitigation Act..... | 60 |
| A. | Legislative History | 60 |
| B. | Application of the Defamation Mitigation Act: Prerequisites To Filing Defamation Suit, Request and Response, Abatement | 63 |
| C. | Limitations of Damages | 64 |
| D. | Harmonizing (or Conflicting) With Texas Citizens Participation Act..... | 64 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| Cases | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| <i>3M Co. v. Boulter</i> , 290 F.R.D. 5 (D.D.C. March 2013) (<i>Boulter II</i>)..... | 51 |
| <i>3M Co. v. Boulter</i> , 842 F. Supp. 2d 85 (D.D.C. 2012)..... | 50 |
| <i>ACS Investors, Inc. v. McLaughlin</i> , 943 S.W.2d 426 (Tex. 1997)..... | 31 |
| <i>Addison v. Holly Hill Fruit Prods., Inc.</i> , 322 U.S. 607, 64 S.Ct. 1215, 88 L.Ed. 1488 (1944)..... | 49 |
| <i>Alex Sheshunoff Mgmt. Servs., L.P. v. Johnson</i> , 209 S.W.3d 644 (Tex. 2006)..... | 48 |
| <i>Alphonso v. Deshotel</i> , 417 S.W.3d 194 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2013, no pet.)..... | 39 |
| <i>Am. Heritage Capital, LP v. Gonzalez</i> , 436 S.W.3d 865 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2014, no pet.)..... | 45 |
| <i>Aquaplex, Inc. v. Rancho La Valencia, Inc.</i> , 297 S.W.3d 768 (Tex. 2009)..... | 31 |
| <i>Ascend Health Corp. v. Wells</i> , No. 4:12-CV-83-BR, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 35237 (E.D.N.C. Mar. 14, 2013) | 52 |
| <i>Avila and Univision v. Larrea</i> , 394 S.W.3d 646 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2012, pet. denied)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Barbara Soules Young v. Krantz</i> , 434 S.W.3d 335 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2014, no pet.)..... | 16 |
| <i>Bedford v. Spasoff</i> , No. 02-15-00045-CV, 2016 Tex. App. LEXIS 1465 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Feb. 11, 2016, no pet. h.) | 55 |
| <i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007)..... | 52 |
| <i>Better Bus. Bureau of Metro. Dallas, Inc. v. BH DFW, Inc.</i> , 402 S.W.3d 299 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2013, pet. denied)..... | 20, 40 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Better Bus. Bureau of Metro. Dallas, Inc. v. Ward</i> , 401 S.W.3d 440 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2013, pet. denied)..... | 20 |
| <i>Better Bus. Bureau of Metro. Houston, Inc. v. John Moore Services</i> , 441 S.W.3d 345 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2013, pet. denied)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Brady v. Fourteenth Court of Appeals</i> , 795 S.W.2d 712 (Tex. 1990)..... | 44, 45 |
| <i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i> , 395 U.S. 444, 89 S. Ct. 1827, 23 L. Ed. 2d 430 (1969)..... | 12 |
| <i>Breitling Oil & Gas Corp. v. Petroleum Newspapers of Alaska, LLC</i> , No. 05-14-00299-CV, 2015 Tex. App. LEXIS 3209 (Tex. App.—Dallas Apr. 1, 2015, pet. denied)..... | 38 |
| <i>Brugger v. Swinford</i> , No. 14-16-00069-CV, 2016 Tex. App. LEXIS 9155 *4 (Tex. App. – Houston [14 th Dist.] Aug. 25, 2016, no pet. h.)..... | 49 |
| <i>Carr v. Brasher</i> , 776 S.W.2d 567 (Tex. 1989)..... | 31 |
| <i>Casso v. Brand</i> , 776 S.W.2d 551 (Tex. 1989)..... | 54, 57 |
| <i>Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire</i> , 315 U.S. 568, 62 S. Ct. 766, 86 L. Ed. 1031 (1942)..... | 12 |
| <i>Charalamboupoulos v. Grammer</i> , 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10507 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 29, 2015) | 17, 32, 52 |
| <i>In re Estate of Check</i> , 438 S.W.3d 829 (Tex. App.—San Antonio [4th Dist.], 2014, no pet.) | 11, 22 |
| <i>Cheniere Energy, Inc. v. Lofti</i> , No. 01-13-00515-CV, 2014 Tex. App. LEXIS 6197 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] June 10, 2014, opinion substituted and withdrawn by 449 S.W.3d 210) | 13, 18 |
| <i>City of Austin v. Whittington</i> , 384 S.W.3d 766 (Tex. 2012)..... | 40 |
| <i>City of Keller v. Wilson</i> , 168 S.W.3d 802 (Tex. 2005)..... | 45, 49, 50 |
| <i>CMH Homes v. Perez</i> , 340 S.W.3d 444 (Tex. 2011)..... | 42, 43 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Coinmach Corp. v. Aspenwood Apartment Corp.</i> , 417 S.W.3d 909 (Tex. 2013)..... | 31 |
| <i>Columbia Med. Ctr. of Las Colinas, Inc. v. Hogue</i> , 271 S.W.3d 238 (Tex. 2008)..... | 49 |
| <i>Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas. v. Sheffield</i> , No. 03-13-00105-CV, 2014 Tex. App. LEXIS 1098 (Tex. App.—Austin Jan. 31, 2014, pet. denied)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Comet Aluminum Co. v. Dibrell</i> , 450 S.W.2d 56 (Tex. 1970) | 24 |
| <i>Cook v. Tom Brown Ministries, et al.</i> , 385 S.W.3d 592 (Tex.App.—El Paso 2012, pet. denied) | 1, 44 |
| <i>Connick v. Myers</i> , 61 U.S. 138 (1983) | 14, 15, 16 |
| <i>Coward v. Gateway Nat’l Bank</i> , 525 S.W.2d 857 (Tex. 1975)..... | 30 |
| <i>Crawford-El v. Britton</i> , 523 U.S. 574, 118 S.Ct. 1584, 140 L.Ed.2d 759 (1998)..... | 52 |
| <i>Croucher v. Croucher</i> , 660 S.W.2d 55 (Tex. 1983)..... | 50 |
| <i>CTL/Thompson Texas, LLC v. Starwood Homeowner’s Ass’n</i> , 390 S.W.3d 299 (Tex. 2013)..... | 38 |
| <i>Culbertson v. Lykos</i> , 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129538 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 11, 2013) | 52 |
| <i>In re D.C.</i> , No. 05-13-00944-CV, 2013 Tex. App. LEXIS 10006 (Tex. App.—Dallas Aug. 9, 2013, <i>appeal dismissed by</i> 2015 Tex. App. LEXIS 5005)(mem. op.)..... | 25 |
| <i>Dallas Morning News, Inc. v. Mapp</i> , No. 05-14-00848-CV, 2015 Tex. App. LEXIS 6600, at *9, 2015 WL 3932868, at *3 (Tex. App.—Dallas June 26, 2015, no pet.) | 24 |
| <i>Direct Commercial Funding, Inc. v. Beacon Hill Estates</i> , No. 14-12-00896-CV, 2013 Tex. App. LEXIS 1898 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] January 24, 2013, no pet.) | 4, 24, 43, 45 |
| <i>Dodson v. Bunton</i> , 81 Tex. 655, 17 S.W. 507 (Tex. 1891) | 49 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>In re Doe</i> , 19 S.W.3d 249 (Tex. 2000)..... | 47 |
| <i>In re E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.</i> , 136 S.W.3d 218 (Tex. 2004)(orig. proceeding)..... | 30 |
| <i>Entergy Gulf States, Inc. v. Summers</i> , 282 S.W.3d 433 (Tex. 2009)..... | 48 |
| <i>Epps v. Fowler</i> , 351 S.W.3d 862 (Tex. 2011)..... | 37 |
| <i>Exxonmobil Pipeline Co. v. Coleman</i> , No. 05-14-00188-CV, 2015 Tex. App. LEXIS 4813 (Tex. App.—Dallas May 12, 2015, pet. filed)..... | 18 |
| <i>Fawcett v. Grosu</i> , No. 14-15-00542-CV, 2016 Tex. App. LEXIS 7183 *18 (Tex. App. – Houston [14 th Dist.] July 7, 2016, no pet. h.)..... | 49 |
| <i>Fazio v Cypress/GR Houston I, L.P.</i> , 403 S.W.3d 390 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2013, pet. denied)..... | 10 |
| <i>Fitzgerald v. Advanced Spine Fixation Systems</i> , 996 S.W.2d 864 (Tex. 1999)..... | 11, 48, 49 |
| <i>Fleming Foods of Tex. v. Rylander</i> , 6 S.W.3d 278 (Tex. 1999)..... | 48 |
| <i>Forbes Inc. v. Granada Biosciences, Inc.</i> , 124 S.W.3d 167 (Tex. 2003)..... | 31, 34 |
| <i>Ford Motor Co. v. Ridgway</i> , 135 S.W.3d 598 (Tex. 2004)..... | 32, 34 |
| <i>Formosa Plastics Corp. USA v. Presidio Eng'rs & Contractors Inc.</i> , 960 S.W.2d 41 (Tex. 1998)..... | 31 |
| <i>Fouts v. Little Cypress-Mauriceville I.S.D.</i> , 2004 Tex. App. LEXIS 9471, at *3 (Tex. App. – Beaumont, 2004, pet. denied) | 15 |
| <i>Godin v. Schencks</i> , 629 F.3d 79 (1st Cir. 2010)..... | 51 |
| <i>Golden Eagle Archery, Inc. v. Jackson</i> , 113 S.W.3d 757 (Tex. 2003)..... | 50 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Goodman v. Ill. Dep't of Fin. & Prof'l Reg.</i> , 430 F.3d 432 (7th Cir. 2005) | 12 |
| <i>Hanssen v. Our Redeemer Lutheran Church</i> , 938 S.W.2d 85 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1996, writ denied) | 18 |
| <i>Henson v. Denison</i> , 546 S.W.2d 898 (Tex. Civ. App.—Fort Worth 1977, no writ)..... | 30 |
| <i>Herrera v. Stahl</i> , 441 S.W.3d 739 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2014, no pet. h)..... | 18 |
| <i>Hinojosa v. Columbia/St. David's Healthcare System, L.P.</i> , 106 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.) | 30 |
| <i>In re Hinterlong</i> , 109 S.W.3d 611 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2003)(orig. proceeding) | 34 |
| <i>Hotchkin v. Bucy</i> , No. 02-13-00173-CV, 2014 Tex. App. LEXIS 13568 (Tex. App.—Ft. Worth, 2014, no pet.)(mem. op.) | 10, 11 |
| <i>Ilf v. Ilff</i> , 339 S.W.3d 74 (Tex. 2011)..... | 44 |
| <i>Inwood Forest Comm. Imp. Ass'n v. Arce</i> , 485 S.W.3d 65, 71 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 2015, pet. filed) | 24 |
| <i>Jain v. Cambridge Petroleum Group, Inc.</i> , 395 S.W. 3d 394 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2013, no pet.)..... | 4, 47 |
| <i>James v. Calkins</i> , 446 S.W.3d 135 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2014, pet. denied)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Jardin v. Marklund et al.</i> , 431 S.W.3d 765 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.], 2014, no pet.)..... | 18, 21 |
| <i>Jennings v. Wallbuilder Presentations, Inc.</i> , 378 S.W.3d 519 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2012, pet. denied) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>KBMT Op. Co. v. Toledo</i> , 434 S.W.3d 276 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2014, pet. granted) | 6, 31 |
| <i>KBMT Op. Co. v. Toledo</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. J. 1257, 2016 Tex. LEXIS 499 (Tex. June 17, 2016) | 6 |
| <i>Kennedy v. Gulf Coast Cancer & Diagnostic Ctr.</i> , 326 S.W.3d 352, 362 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2010, no pet.) | 56 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Kennedy v. Tangipahoa Parish Library Bd. Of Control</i> , 224 F.3d 359 (5th Cir. 2000) | 15 |
| <i>King Ranch, Inc. v. Chapman</i> , 118 S.W.3d 742 (Tex. 2003)..... | 47 |
| <i>Kinney v. BCG Attorney Search</i> , No. 03-12-00579-CV, 2013 Tex. App. LEXIS 10481 (Tex. App.—Austin, 2013, opinion withdrawn by No. 03-12-00579, 2014 Tex. App. LEXIS 3998)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Kool Smiles v. Mauze & Bagby, P.L.L.C.</i> , 745 F.3d 742 (5th Cir. 2014) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>KTRK Television, Inc. v. Robinson</i> , 409 S.W.3d 682 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2013, pet. denied)..... | 28, 43 |
| <i>Klentzman v. Brady</i> , 456 S.W.3d 239 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] 2014, pet. granted) | 14 |
| <i>Lamons Gasket Co. v. Flexitallic LP</i> , 9 F.Supp.3d 709 (S.D. Tex. 2014) | 32, 52 |
| <i>LeCroy v. Hanlon</i> , 713 S.W.2d 335 (Tex. 1986)..... | 33 |
| <i>Lippincott v. Whisenhunt</i> , 462 S.W.3d 507 (Tex. 2015)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>In re Lipsky (Lipsky I)</i> , 411 S.W.3d 530 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2013)(orig. proceeding) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>In re Lipsky (Lipsky II)</i> , 460 S.W.3d 579 (Tex. 2015)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Lipsky v. Range Production Co., et al.</i> , No. 02-12-00098-CV, 2012 Tex. App. LEXIS 7059 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth, 2012, pet. denied)(mem. op.) | 41 |
| <i>Low v. Henry</i> , 221 S.W.3d 609 (Tex. 2007)..... | 39 |
| <i>Martinez v. Humble Sand & Gravel, Inc.</i> , 875 S.W.2d 311 (Tex. 1994)..... | 45 |
| <i>In re McAllen Med. Ctr., Inc.</i> , 275 S.W.3d 458 (Tex. 2008)(orig. proceeding)..... | 44 |
| <i>McDonald v. Clemens</i> , 464 S.W.2d 450 (Tex. Civ. App.—Tyler 1971, no writ)..... | 28 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Memorial Hospital – The Woodlands v. McCown</i> , 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996) | 15 |
| <i>Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.</i> , 497 U.S. 1 (1990)..... | 31, 54 |
| <i>Miller Weisbrod LLC v. Llamas-Soforo</i> , No. 08-12-00278-CV, 2014 Tex. App. LEXIS 12745 (Tex. App.—El Paso Nov. 25, 2014, no pet.) | 20 |
| <i>Morris v. Crow</i> , 142 F.3d 1379 (11th Cir. 1998) | 15 |
| <i>N.Y. Underwriters Ins. Co. v. Sanchez</i> , 799 S.W.2d 677 (Tex. 1990)..... | 42 |
| <i>National Surety Corp. v. Ladd</i> , 131 Tex. 295, 115 S.W.2d 600 (Tex. 1938) | 48 |
| <i>Neely v. Wilson</i> , 2013 Tex. LEXIS 511, 56 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 766 (June 28, 2013) | 54, 57 |
| <i>Nero v. Hospital Auth.</i> , 86 F.Supp. 2d 1214 (S.D. Ga. 1998) | 15 |
| <i>Newspaper Holdings, Inc. v. Crazy Hotel Assisted Living, Ltd.</i> , 416 S.W.3d 71 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2013, pet. denied)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>In re Office of the Attorney General</i> , 422 S.W.3d 623 (Tex. 2013)..... | 48 |
| <i>Osborne v. Ohio</i> , 495 U.S. 103 (1990)..... | 12 |
| <i>Ostrovitz & Gwinn, LLC v. First Specialty Ins. Co.</i> , 393 S.W.3d 379 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2012, no pet.)..... | 31 |
| <i>P&G v. Amway Corp.</i> , 242 F.3d 539 (5th Cir. 2001) | 12 |
| <i>Parker v. Walton</i> , 233 S.W.3d 535 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2007, no pet.)..... | 4 |
| <i>Pena v. Perel</i> , 417 S.W. 3d 552 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2013, no pet.)..... | 21 |
| <i>Pickens v. Cordia</i> , 433 S.W.3d 179 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2014, no pet.)..... | 13, 16 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Pool v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 715 S.W.2d 629 (Tex. 1986)(op. on reh'g)..... | 50 |
| <i>Public Utility Comm'n of Texas v. Cofer</i> , 754 S.W.2d 121 (Tex. 1988)..... | 48 |
| <i>Quick v. City of Austin</i> , 7 S.W.3d 109 (Tex. 1998)..... | 48 |
| <i>Railroad Comm'n of Tex. v. Tex. Citizens for a Safe Future and Clean Water</i> , 336 S.W.3d 619 (Tex. 2011)..... | 48 |
| <i>Ramsey v. Lynch</i> , No. 10-12-00198-CV, 2013 Tex. App. LEXIS 5554 (Tex. App.—Waco May 2, 2013, no pet.)(mem. op.)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Rankin v. McPherson</i> , 483 U.S. 378 (1987) | 14 |
| <i>Rehak Creative Servs. v. Witt</i> , 404 S.W.3d 716 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2013, pet. denied) | 28, 32 |
| <i>Richardson-Eagle, Inc. v. Mercer, Inc.</i> , 213 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, pet. denied)..... | 31 |
| <i>Rio Grande H2O Guardian v. Robert Muller Family P'ship</i> , No. 04-13-00441-CV, 2014 Tex. App. LEXIS 915 (Tex. App.—San Antonio, Jan. 29, 2014, no pet.)..... | 16, 28 |
| <i>Rivers v. Johnson Custodial Home, Inc.</i> , No. A-14-CA-484-SS, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117759 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 22, 2014) | 13, 52 |
| <i>Roth v. United States</i> , 354 U.S. 476 (1957)..... | 12 |
| <i>Russell v. Russell</i> , 865 S.W.2d 929 (Tex. 1993)..... | 32 |
| <i>Salge v. Edna I.S.D.</i> , 411 F.3d 178 (5th Cir. 2005)..... | 15, 16 |
| <i>San Jacinto Title Services v. Kingsley Properties, LP</i> , No. 13-12-003520CV, 2013 Tex. App. LEXIS 5081 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi – Edinburg April 25, 2013, pet. denied) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Sax v. Votteler</i> , 648 S.W.2d 661 (Tex. 1983)..... | 33 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Schimmel v. McGregor</i> , 438 S.W.3d 847 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2014, pet. denied)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Schlumberger Ltd. v. Rutherford</i> , 472 S.W.3d 881 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2015, no pet.)..... | 32, 38 |
| <i>Serafine v. Blunt</i> , 466 S.W.3d 352 (Tex. App.—Austin, June 26, 2015, no pet.)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Service Corp. v. Guerra</i> , 348 S.W.3d 221 (Tex. 2011)..... | 50 |
| <i>Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs. v. Allstate Ins. Co.</i> , 559 U.S. 393, 130 S.Ct. 1431, 1437, 176 L.Ed.2d 311(2010)..... | 51 |
| <i>Shipp v. Malouf</i> , 439 S.W.3d 432 (Tex. App.—Dallas [5th Dist.], Jun. 24, 2014, pet. denied)..... | 6 |
| <i>Smith v. Smith</i> , 126 S.W.3d 660 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2004, no pet.)..... | 34 |
| <i>Sorokolit v. Rhodes</i> , 889 S.W.2d 239 (Tex. 1994)..... | 48 |
| <i>Southwest Energy Prod. Co. v. Berry Helfand</i> , 411 S.W.3d 581 (Tex. App.—Tyler 2013, reversed by and remanded by 2016 Tex. LEXIS 480 (Tex., June 10, 2016)..... | 32 |
| <i>Sтары v. DeBord</i> , 967 S.W.2d 352 (Tex. 1998)..... | 42 |
| <i>State v. Naylor</i> , 466 S.W.3d 783, 788 (Tex. 2015) | 24 |
| <i>State Farm Ins. Co. v. Pults</i> , 850 S.W.2d 691(Tex. App. – Corpus Christi 1993, no writ) | 24 |
| <i>Stockton v. Offenbach</i> , 336 S.W.3d 610 (Tex. 2011)..... | 49 |
| <i>Summersett v. Jaiyeola</i> , 438 S.W.3d 84 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2013, pet. denied)..... | 40 |
| <i>In re Team Rocket, L.P.</i> , 256 S.W.3d 257 (Tex. 2008)(orig. proceeding)..... | 44 |
| <i>Tenet Hospitals Ltd. v. Rivera</i> , 445 S.W.3d 698, 702 (Tex. 2014)..... | 55, 57 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Terrell v. Univ. of Texas Sys. Police</i> , 792 F.2d 1360 (5th Cir. 1986) | 15 |
| <i>Tex. Dep't of Parks & Wildlife v. Miranda</i> , 133 S.W.3d 217 (Tex. 2004)..... | 50 |
| <i>Tex. Tech Univ. Health Science Ctr. v. Apodaca</i> , 876 S.W.2d 402 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1994, writ denied)..... | 30 |
| <i>Tex. Workers' Comp. Comm'n v. Garcia</i> , 893 S.W.2d 504, 518 (Tex. 1995)..... | 55 |
| <i>Texas Mun. Power Agency v. Public Util. Comm'n</i> , 253 S.W.3d 184 (Tex. 1997)..... | 48 |
| <i>In re Thuesen</i> , No. 14-13-00255-CV, 2013 Tex. App. LEXIS 4636 (Tex. App.—Houston [14 th Dist.] April 11, 2013, no pet.)(orig. proceeding) (mem.op.)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Trinity River Auth. v. URS Consultants, Inc.</i> , 889 S.W.2d 259 (Tex. 1994)..... | 33 |
| <i>Ex parte Tucci</i> , 859 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1993) | 54 |
| <i>Turner v. KTRK Television, Inc.</i> , 38 S.W.3d 103 (Tex. 2000)..... | 31, 54, 55 |
| <i>In re United Scaffolding, Inc.</i> , 301 S.W.3d 661 (Tex. 2010)(orig. proceeding)..... | 44 |
| <i>United States v. Lockheed Missiles & Space Co.</i> , 190 F.3d 963 (9th Cir. 1999) | 51 |
| <i>UTMB v. Estate of Blackmon</i> , 195 S.W.3d 98 (Tex. 2006)..... | 37 |
| <i>Villafani v. Trejo</i> , 251 S.W.3d 466 (Tex. 2008)..... | 38 |
| <i>Vincenty v. Bloomberg</i> , 476 F.3d 74 (2nd Cir. 2007)..... | 12 |
| <i>Walker v. Packer</i> , 827 S.W.2d 833 (Tex. 1991)..... | 44 |
| <i>WFAA-TV Inc. v. McLemore</i> , 978 S.W.2d 568 (Tex. 1998)..... | 31 |

| | |
|--|--------|
| <i>Wholesale TV and Radio Advertising, LLC v. Better Bus. Bureau of Metro. Dallas, Inc.</i> , No. 05-11-01337-CV, 2013 Tex. App. LEXIS 7348 (Tex. App.—Dallas June 14, 2013, no pet.)..... | 20, 30 |
|--|--------|

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Williams v. Cordillera Communications, Inc.</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79584 (S.D. Tex. 2014) | 52 |
|---|----|

Rules and Statutes

| | |
|--|------------|
| CA. CIV. PROC. CODE § 425.16(B)(1) | 10 |
| D.C. CODE §§ 16-5501-5505..... | 50 |
| FED. R. CIV. P. 1 | 51, 53 |
| FED. R. CIV. P. 6(b) | 21 |
| FED. R. CIV. P. 8 | 48 |
| FED. R. CIV. P. 9 | 48 |
| FED. R. CIV. P. 12 | 18, 47, 48 |
| FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b) | 23 |
| FED. R. CIV. P. 12(d) | 48 |
| FED. R. CIV. P. 56 | 47, 50 |
| HAW. REV. STAT. § 634F-1 (2011)..... | 2 |
| LOCAL RULE CV-7(d), U.S. DIST. CT. W.D. OF TEX..... | 21 |
| TEX. BUS. & COM. CODE §17.01, <i>et seq.</i> | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 9.001, <i>et seq.</i> | 4 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 9.002(a)(2)..... | 5 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 9.003 | 49 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 10.001 | 4, 39 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 10.001, <i>et seq.</i> | 4, 56, 57 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE §10.002(a) | 4 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 10.002(b) | 4 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 10.004..... | 4 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 10.005..... | 39 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 10.006..... | 4 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 22.021, <i>et seq.</i> | 6 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 22.024..... | 29 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001, <i>et seq.</i> | 1, 50 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001(1)..... | 12 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001(2)..... | 17 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001(3)..... | 12 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001(4)..... | 16 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001(4)(a)(ii)..... | 10 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001(6)..... | 10, 11, 35 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001(7)..... | 14 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.002..... | 3, 55 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.003..... | 1, 41 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.003(a)..... | 10, 21, 22 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.003(b)..... | 22 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.003(c)..... | 24, 35, 55 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.004..... | 9, 23, 25 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.004(a)..... | 22 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.004(b)..... | 9, 22 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.004(c)..... | 9, 22, 25 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.005..... | 1, 24, 45, 46 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.005(a)..... | 23, 24 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.005(b)..... | 27, 35 |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.005(c) | <i>passim</i> |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.005(d) | 10, 36 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.006 | 22 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.006(a) | 26 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.006(b) | 25 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.007 | 37 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.007(a) | 37 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.007(b) | 37 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.008 | <i>passim</i> |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.008(a) | 41, 42, 46, 47 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.008(b) | <i>passim</i> |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.008(c) | 9, 44, 46, 47 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.009 | 39 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.009(a) | 38 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.009(a)(1) | 27 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.009(b) | 40 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.010 | 9 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.010(a) | 19 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.010(b) | 19 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.010(c) | 19 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.010(d) | 20 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.011(b) | 23, 43, 45 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 37.006 | 60 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 41.001(2) | 28 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 41.003 | 39 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 51.014..... | 8, 41, 42, 47 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 51.014(6) | 7 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 51.014(a)(6)..... | 40 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 51.014(a)(12)..... | 8, 41 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 51.014(b) | 40 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73..... | 7, 8 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73 (SUBCHAPTER B)..... | 60 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.001 <i>et seq.</i> | 7 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.003(a)(3)..... | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.052..... | 61 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.053..... | 63 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.055(a) | 63 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.055(b) | 63 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.055(c) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.055(d) | 63 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.056(a) | 63 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.056(b) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.057(a) | 63 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.057(b) | 63 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.057(c) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.057(d) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.057(e) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.058(a) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.058(b) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.058(d) | 64 |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.059 | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.061(a) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.061(b) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.062 | 64, 65 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.062(a) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.062(b) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.062(c) | 64 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 73.062(d) | 65 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE CHAPTER 22 | 57 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE CHAPTER 22, SUBCHAPTER C | 29 |
| TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE CHAPTER 150 | 34 |
| TEX. CONST. art. I, § 8 | 7, 54, 55, 56 |
| TEX. CONST. art. I, § 13 | 33, 54, 55, 56 |
| TEX. CONST. art. V, § 6 | 42 |
| TEX. CONST. art. V, § 31(b) | 53 |
| TEX. CONST. art. V, § 31(c) | 53 |
| TEX. ELEC. CODE § 253.131(a) | 58 |
| TEX. ELEC. CODE § 273.081 | 58 |
| TEX. GOV'T CODE § 22.001(a)(2) | 43 |
| TEX. GOV'T CODE § 22.002 | 47 |
| TEX. GOV'T CODE § 22.004(c) | 53 |
| TEX. GOV'T CODE § 22.221 | 47 |
| TEX. GOV'T CODE § 311.016 | 39 |
| TEX. GOV'T CODE § 311.022 | 40 |
| TEX. GOV'T CODE § 402.010 | 60 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| TEX. R. APP. P. 25.1 | 47 |
| TEX. R. APP. P. 26 | 46 |
| TEX. R. APP. P. 26.1 | 47 |
| TEX. R. APP. P. 52 | 47 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 1 | 53 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 2 | 53 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 13 | 4, 37, 39 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 21 | 23 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 41 | 35 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 48 | 26 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 51 | 35 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 97 | 36 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 162 | 37 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 166a | 23, 53 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 166a(c) | 23 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 166a(i) | 34 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 174(a) | 36 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 174(b) | 36 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.3(a) | 26 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 196.2 | 25 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 199.2(5) | 25 |
| TEX. R. CIV. P. 215 | 39 |
| Other Authorities | |
| 12 TEX. B. J. 531 (1949) | 53 |
| BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 287 (9 TH ED. 2009) | 28 |

| | |
|--|--------|
| BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY (8 TH ED.) | 28 |
| BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 351 (10 TH ED. 2014) | 29 |
| Brief of Univision, <i>Virgilio Avila and Univision Television Group, Inc. v. Larrea</i> , No. 05-11-01637, Court of Appeals of Dallas, Texas | 33 |
| Edmond Costantini & Mary Paul Nash, <i>SLAPP/SLAPP back: The Misuse of Libel Law for Political Purposes and Countersuit Response</i> , 7 J.L. & POL 417, 423 (1991)..... | 2 |
| George W. Pring, <i>SLAPP: Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation</i> , 7 <i>PACE ENV’L. L. REV.</i> 3, 5-6 (1998)..... | 2 |
| H. Comm. on Judiciary & Civ. Jurisprudence, <i>Bill Analysis</i> , Tex. H.B. 1759, 83d Leg., R.S., No. 83R 23145, at 1 (Tex. 2013)..... | 61 |
| H. Comm. on Judiciary & Civ. Jurisprudence, <i>Bill Analysis</i> , Tex. H.B. 1759, 83d Leg., R.S., No. 83R 23145, at 6 (Tex. 2013)..... | 62 |
| H. Comm. on Judiciary & Civ. Jurisprudence, <i>Bill Analysis</i> , Tex. H.B. 2935, 83d Leg., R.S., No. 83R 21446, at 1–2 (Tex. 2013)..... | 9 |
| H. Comm. On Judiciary and Civ. Jurisprudence, <i>Bill Analysis</i> , Tex. HB 2973, 82 nd Leg., R.S. (2011)..... | 4, 5 |
| H. Research Org., Texas House of Representatives, <i>Bill Analysis</i> , Tex. H.B. 2973 (May 2, 2011)..... | 6, 7 |
| Hearing on Tex. CSHB 2973 Before the Senate Comm. on State Affairs, 82 nd Leg., R.S. (May 12, 2011) | 7 |
| Hearing on Tex. H.B. 1759 Before the H. Comm. on Judiciary & Civ. Jurisprudence at 1:43:01, 2013 Leg., 83d Sess. (Tex. 2013)..... | 61 |
| Hearing on Tex. H.B. 1759 Before the Sen. Comm. on State Affairs at 00:10:50, 2013 Leg., 83d Sess. (Tex. 2013) | 63 |
| Hearing on Tex. H.B. 2935 Before the H. Comm. on Judiciary & Civ. Jurisprudence, 2013 Leg., 83d Sess. (Tex. 2013)..... | 9 |
| Hearings on Tex. H.B. 2973 Before the H. Comm. on Judiciary & Civ. Jurisprudence, 82 nd Leg., R.S. 10-17 (March 28, 2011)..... | 7 |
| http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/83R/analysis/pdf/HB01759H.pdf#navpanes =0 | 61, 62 |
| http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/83R/analysis/pdf/HB02935H.pdf#navpanes =0 | 9 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/83R/senateamendana/pdf/HB01759A.pdf#navpanes=0 | 63 |
| http://www.foift.org/ | 6 |
| http://www.foift.org/?page_id=796 | 6 |
| http://www.foift.org/?page_id=1923 | 6 |
| http://haynesandboone.com/Laura-Prather/ | 6 |
| http://www.house.state.tx.us/video-audio/committee-broadcasts/committee-archives/player/?session=83&committee=330&ram=13040114330 | 8, 61, 62 |
| http://www.sdma.com/laura-prathers-efforts-lead-to-passage-of-texas-anti-slapp-law-06-12-2011/ | 6 |
| http://www.sdma.com/texas-newsrooms-will-benefit-from-anti-slapp-law-07-15-2011/ | 30, 33 |
| http://www.senate.state.tx.us/75r/senate/commit/c570/c570.htm | 62, 63 |
| Jerome I. Braun, <i>Increasing SLAPP Protection: Unburdening the Right of Petition in California</i> , 32 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 965, 969-70 (1999)..... | 2 |
| John G. Osborn and Jeffrey A. Thaler, <i>Feature: Maine’s Anti-SLAPP Law: Special Protection Against Improper Lawsuits Targeting Free Speech and Petitioning</i> , 23 MAINE BAR J. 32 (2008)..... | 3, 58 |
| Joshua L. Baker, <i>Review of Selected 2003 California Legislation: Civil: Chapter 338: Another New Law, Another SLAPP in the Face of California Business</i> , 35 MCGEORGE L. REV. 409 (2004)..... | 58 |
| Mark J. Sobczak, Symposium: <i>The Modern American Jury: Comment: Slapped in Illinois: The Scope and Applicability of the Illinois Citizen Participation Act</i> , 28 N. Ill. U. L. Rev. 559, 560-61 (2008)..... | 2 |
| MERRIAM-WEBSTER’S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY 229 (11th ed. 2003)..... | 28 |
| MERRIAM-WEBSTER’S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY AT 1198..... | 28 |
| Nathan L. Hecht & E. Lee Parsley, <u>Procedural Reform: Whence and Whither</u> (Sept. 1997)..... | 53 |
| Richard J. Yurko and Shannon C. Choy, <i>Legal Analysis: Reconciling the anti-SLAPP Statute With Abuse of Process and Other Litigation-Based Torts</i> , 51 B.B.J. 15, 15 (2007)..... | 3 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Sen. Amendments Section-by-Section Analysis, Tex. H.B. 1759, 83d Leg., R.S., No. 13.140.359, at 7 (Tex. 2013)..... | 63 |
| Tex. H.B. 1759, 83d Leg., R.S., No. 83R 23145, at 1 (Tex. 2013)..... | 61 |
| Tex. H.B. 2935, 8d Leg., R.S. (2013)..... | 8 |
| Texas Medical Liability Insurance Improvement Act | 38 |
| Texas Theft Liability Act..... | 32 |
| WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, OTHELLO, act 3 sc. 3 | 54 |

I. INTRODUCTION.

On June 17, 2011, Texas Governor Rick Perry affixed his neat signature to Texas' new anti-SLAPP¹ law, ironically named the Texas Citizens Participation Act (the "TCPA"), and in so doing Texas joined 28 states and the District of Columbia in enacting various forms of legislation purportedly aimed at preventing frivolous lawsuits from stifling free speech activities and the rights of petition and association.² The TCPA is the broadest anti-SLAPP law in the country.

Over the last five years the TCPA has triggered significant unintended consequences, especially for persons and entities who file suit to protect their reputations and property interests. Motions to dismiss under the TCPA appear to be the fastest growing motions practice in Texas. The TCPA introduces what one judge called a "draconian" motion to dismiss that places a heavy burden on the aggrieved plaintiff to prove that its suit is not frivolous at the inception of the litigation without the benefit of any meaningful discovery.³ Of the over

¹ "Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation."

² See TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001, *et seq.* The 28 other states, in addition to the District of Columbia, were Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, and Washington.

³ In a campaign finance law case, the Mayor of El Paso filed suit to enjoin violations of the Texas Elections Code by several corporations and a group of individuals. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss under the lawsuit under the new anti-SLAPP statute, arguing that the corporate contributions at issue in the case were a form of "protected speech." In denying the motion to dismiss, Judge Javier Alvarez stated that the new procedure for dismissal of a lawsuit without discovery and with the burden on the plaintiff was too draconian. The authors of this

160 cases reported under the TCPA to date, none but one or two could be characterized as a SLAPP case. The very broad application of the TCPA captures a very broad variety of claims that do not resemble a SLAPP case. So long as a defendant in a reputational or other business torts suit can characterize the suit as "based on," "relating to," or "in response to" the exercise of free speech, petition or association, the motion to dismiss can be filed, and unless the plaintiff presents "clear and specific" evidence of a prima facie case of each element of his claim, the motion to dismiss must be granted.⁴

The potential for extension of this dispositive motion far beyond the prevention of SLAPP suits is significant. Here are two hypothetical examples:

Example 1: Disgruntled Vocal Car Buyer: Car Dealer sells a new car to a customer who is dissatisfied, and takes her dissatisfaction to the internet and consumer protection agencies. Buyer expresses views that accuse the dealership not only of misrepresentations about worthiness of the vehicle, but that the dealer engages in fraud, illegal kickback schemes, and violations of state and federal advertising laws, some of which carry criminal penalties, and organizes a boycott. Customer sues Car Dealer under the DTPA. Dealer counterclaims for tortious interference and business disparagement, and seeks injunctive relief. How does the TCPA apply?

Example 2: Medical Group Divorce: When Doctor A leaves the

paper were counsel for the plaintiff in that case. See *Cook v. Tom Brown Ministries, et al.*, 385 S.W.3d 592 (Tex.App.—El Paso 2012, pet. denied) (related interlocutory appeal of temporary injunction).

⁴TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.003 & 27.005.

practice over the weekend, he takes lists of all patients of the clinic, not just his own, along with all medical files A-K, prior to obtaining any patient consents. Over the weekend Doctor A calls a number of patients and informs them that Doctors B and C are currently under investigation by the Texas Medical Board and are about to lose their licenses because of “rampant allegations” of improper contact with female patients, and urges the patients to leave the clinic to become his patients, and call all their friends and tell them the same thing. When Doctors B and C find out, they file suit against Dr. A seeking injunctive relief for the return of patient files and protected health information, to prevent Dr. A from continuing his communications, and for damages for defamation, business disparagement, and tortious interference. How does the TCPA apply?

II. THE TEXAS CITIZENS PARTICIPATION ACT: WHAT IS IT?

A. Background and Enactment of the TCPA.

1. What is a SLAPP lawsuit?

The general consensus view among commentators is that SLAPP suits are “legally meritless suits designed, from their inception, to intimidate and harass political critics into silence.”⁵ Hawaii defines a SLAPP suit as “a lawsuit that lacks substantial justification or is interposed for delay or harassment and that is solely based on the party’s public participation before a

⁵ Mark J. Sobczak, Symposium: *The Modern American Jury: Comment: Slapped in Illinois: The Scope and Applicability of the Illinois Citizen Participation Act*, 28 N. Ill. U. L. Rev. 559, 560-61 (2008), quoting Edmond Costantini & Mary Paul Nash, *SLAPP/SLAPP back: The Misuse of Libel Law for Political Purposes and Countersuit Response*, 7 J.L. & POL 417, 423 (1991).

governmental body.”⁶ According to some views, the typical SLAPP plaintiff “does not seek victory on the merits, but rather victory by attrition.”⁷ The “object is to quell opposition by fear of large recoveries and legal costs, by diverting energy and resources from opposing the project into defending the lawsuit, and by transforming the debate from a political one to a judicial one, with a corresponding shift of issues from the targets’ grievances to the filers’ grievances.”⁸ The goal of a SLAPP suit is to “stop citizens from exercising their political rights or to punish them for having done so.”⁹ None of the reported Texas decisions to date defines the scope of a SLAPP suit, and the Texas Legislature curiously never referred to SLAPPs in the legislation.

By definition, in the “typical” SLAPP case the motivation of the plaintiff is not to achieve a legal victory resulting in a judgment, but instead to make it prohibitively expensive and burdensome for the defendant to continue participation in her constitutionally protected activity. In other words, improper motive is an essential element of a SLAPP lawsuit. The concept assumes that the SLAPP plaintiff enjoys a great advantage in resources to fund litigation, and can afford to overwhelm the defendant with lawsuit expenses and fees. As one commentator explained, “[t]he typical SLAPP suit is brought by a well-heeled ‘Goliath’ against a ‘David’ with fewer resources, trying to keep David from opposing, for example, Goliath’s

⁶ HAW. REV. STAT. § 634F-1 (2011).

⁷ Sobczak, *supra*, at 561.

⁸ *Id.*, quoting Jerome I. Braun, *Increasing SLAPP Protection: Unburdening the Right of Petition in California*, 32 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 965, 969-70 (1999).

⁹ *Id.*, citing George W. Pring, *SLAPP: Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation*, 7 PACE ENV’L. L. REV. 3, 5-6 (1998).

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: The Texas Anti-SLAPP Law: Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ch. 27 - And The Mulligan Law - The Defamation Mitigation Act: What Remains of Texas Reputational Torts?

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2016 Page Keeton Civil Litigation eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the 40th Annual Page Keeton Civil Litigation Conference session

"Anti SLAAP: What is Left of Reputational Torts So Long As This Statute is on the Books? "