

**PRESENTED AT**

**27<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals**

June 1-2, 2017

Austin, Texas

## **Texas Supreme Court Update**

**Hon. Jeffrey S. Boyd**

**Constance H. Pfeiffer**

---

## **SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS UPDATE**

---

**Phil Johnson**  
*Justice*  
Supreme Court of Texas

**Heather Holmes**  
*Staff Attorney*

**Robert Brailas**  
*Staff Attorney*

**Jake Rutherford**  
*Law Clerk*

**Taylor Whitlow**  
*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.**

---

**February 1, 2016 – January 31, 2017**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. SCOPE OF THIS ARTICLE</b> .....	1
<b>II. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW</b> .....	1
<b>A. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies</b> .....	1
1. <u>Clint Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Marquez</u> , 487 S.W.3d 538 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [14-0903]..	1
2. <u>McIntyre v. El Paso Indep. Sch. Dist.</u> , 499 S.W.3d 820 (Tex. June 24, 2016) [14-0732]..	1
<b>B. Public Information Act</b> .....	2
1. <u>Paxton v. City of Dallas</u> , 453 S.W.3d 580 (Tex. App.—Austin 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 359 (Feb. 19, 2016) [15-0073], <i>consolidated with</i> , <u>Paxton v. City of Dallas</u> , 2015 WL 601974 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 359 (Feb. 19, 2016) [15-0238]..	2
<b>C. Public Utility Commission</b> .....	3
1. <u>Oncor Elec. Delivery Co. LLC v. Pub. Util. Comm’n of Texas</u> , 507 S.W.3d 706 (Tex. Jan. 9, 2017) [15-0005]..	3
<b>D. Rulemaking</b> .....	3
1. <u>State Bd. of Exam’rs of Marriage &amp; Family Therapists v. Tex. Med. Ass’n</u> , 458 S.W.3d 552 (Tex. App.—Austin 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1592 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0299]..	3
<b>E. Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission</b> .....	4
1. <u>Cadena Comercial USA Corp. v. Tex. Alcoholic Beverage Comm’n</u> , 449 S.W.3d 154 (Tex. App.—Austin 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 939 (May 27, 2016) [14-0819]..	4
<b>III. ARBITRATION</b> .....	4
<b>A. Judicial Review</b> .....	4
1. <u>Cardwell v. Whataburger Rests. LLC</u> , 484 S.W.3d 426 (Tex. Feb. 26, 2016) [14-1019]..	4
2. <u>Forest Oil Corp. v. El Rucio Land &amp; Cattle Co.</u> , 446 S.W.3d 58 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 126 (Dec. 2, 2016) [14-0979]..	5
3. <u>Hoskins v. Hoskins</u> , 497 S.W.3d 490 (Tex. May 20, 2016) [15-0046]..	5
<b>B. Waiver of Arbitration</b> .....	6
1. <u>RSL Funding, LLC v. Pippins</u> , 499 S.W.3d 423 (Tex. July 1, 2016) [14-0457].....	6
<b>IV. ASSET FORFEITURE</b> .....	7
<b>A. Exclusionary Rule</b> .....	7
1. <u>State v. One (1) 2004 Lincoln Navigator</u> , 494 S.W.3d 690 (Tex. June 10, 2016) [14-0692]..	7
<b>V. ATTORNEYS</b> .....	7
<b>A. Breach of Fiduciary Duty</b> .....	7
1. <u>First United Pentecostal Church of Beaumont v. Parker</u> , 2015 WL 4760181 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1594 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0708]..	7

<b>B. Legal Malpractice</b> .....	8
1. <u>Rogers v. Zanetti</u> , 2015 WL 3658024 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 30 (Oct. 21, 2016) [15-0557].....	8
2. <u>Stanfield v. Neubaum</u> , 494 S.W.3d 90 (Tex. June 24, 2016) [15-0387].....	8
<b>VI. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW</b> .....	9
<b>A. Home Equity Loans</b> .....	9
1. <u>Garofolo v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, L.L.C.</u> , 497 S.W.3d 474 (Tex. May 20, 2016) [15-0437].....	9
2. <u>Wood v. HSBC Bank USA, N.A.</u> , 505 S.W.3d 542 (Tex. May 20, 2016) [14-0714].....	10
<b>B. Same-sex Marriage</b> .....	11
1. <u>Pidgeon v. Turner</u> , 477 S.W.3d 353 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 222 (Jan. 20, 2017) [15-0688].....	11
<b>C. School Finance</b> .....	11
1. <u>Morath v. Tex. Taxpayer &amp; Student Fairness Coalition</u> , 490 S.W.3d 826 (Tex. May 13, 2016) [14-0776].....	11
<b>D. Takings</b> .....	12
1. <u>Harris Cty. Flood Control Dist. v. Kerr</u> , 499 S.W.3d 793 (Tex. June 17, 2016) [13-0303].....	12
<b>E. Texas Elections Code</b> .....	12
1. <u>King St. Patriots v. Tex. Democratic Party</u> , 459 S.W.3d 631 (Tex. App.—Austin 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1655 (Sept. 23, 2016) [15-0320].....	12
<b>VII. CONTRACTS</b> .....	13
<b>A. Forum-Selection Clauses</b> .....	13
1. <u>Pinto Tech. Ventures, L.P. v. Sheldon</u> , 477 S.W.3d 411 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 137 (Dec. 23, 2016) [16-0007].....	13
<b>B. Third-Party Beneficiaries</b> .....	13
1. <u>First Bank v. Brumitt</u> , 472 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 138 (Dec. 23, 2016) [15-0844].....	13
<b>VIII. CORPORATIONS</b> .....	14
<b>A. Corporate Opportunity</b> .....	14
1. <u>Longview Energy Co. v. Huff Energy Fund LP</u> , 482 S.W.3d 184 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 138 (Dec. 26, 2016) [15-0968].....	14
<b>IX. DAMAGES</b> .....	15
<b>A. Civil Penalties</b> .....	15
1. <u>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Forte</u> , 497 S.W.3d 460 (Tex. May 20, 2016) [15-0146].....	15
<b>B. Misappropriation</b> .....	15
1. <u>Sw. Energy Prod. Co. v. Berry-Helfand</u> , 491 S.W.3d 699 (Tex. June 10, 2016) [13-0986].....	15
<b>C. Punitive Damages</b> .....	16
1. <u>Horizon Health Corp. v. Acadia Healthcare Co.</u> , 472 S.W.3d 74 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 223 (Jan. 23, 2017) [15-0819].....	16

<b>X. EMPLOYMENT LAW</b> .....	17
<b>A. Employment Contracts</b> .....	17
1. <u>Cmty. Health Sys. Prof'l Servs. Corp. v. Hansen</u> , 2014 WL 5794872 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 137 (Dec. 23, 2016) [14-1033].....	17
<b>B. Employment Discrimination</b> .....	17
1. <u>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Rincones</u> , 457 S.W.3d 221 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1655 (Sept. 23, 2016) [15-0240].....	17
<b>C. Law Enforcement Officers</b> .....	18
1. <u>Colorado Cty. v. Staff</u> , 470 S.W.3d 251 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1157 (June 17, 2016) [15-0912].....	18
<b>D. Whistleblower Actions</b> .....	18
1. <u>McMillen v. Tex. Health &amp; Human Servs. Comm'n</u> , 485 S.W.3d 427 (Tex. Feb. 26, 2016) [15-0147].....	18
<b>E. Wrongful Discharge</b> .....	18
1. <u>El Paso Healthcare Sys., Ltd. v. Murphy</u> , 2015 WL 4082857 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1656 (Sept. 23, 2016) [15-0575].....	18
<b>XI. FAMILY LAW</b> .....	19
<b>A. Child Support</b> .....	19
1. <u>Ochsner v. Ochsner</u> , S.W.3d , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1359 (Tex. June 24, 2016) [14-0638].....	19
<b>B. Divorce Decrees</b> .....	20
1. <u>Kramer v. Kastleman</u> , 508 S.W.3d 211 (Tex. Jan. 30, 2017) [14-1038].....	20
2. <u>Loya v. Loya</u> , 473 S.W.3d 362 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 223 (Jan. 20, 2017) [15-0763].....	21
<b>XII. GOVERNMENTAL IMMUNITY</b> .....	21
<b>A. Contract Claims</b> .....	21
1. <u>Byrdson Servs., LLC v. Se. Tex. Reg'l Planning Comm'n</u> , S.W.3d , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 154 (Tex. Dec. 23, 2016) [15-0158].....	21
2. <u>Wasson Interests, Ltd. v. City of Jacksonville</u> , 489 S.W.3d 427 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [14-0645].....	22
3. <u>Wheelabrator Air Pollution Control, Inc. v. City of San Antonio</u> , 489 S.W.3d 448 (Tex. Apr. 15, 2016) [15-0029].....	22
<b>B. Finality of Judgments</b> .....	23
1. <u>Engelman Irrigation Dist. v. Shields Bros., Inc.</u> , 2015 WL 233491 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1655 (Sept. 23, 2016) [15-0188].....	23
<b>C. Interlocutory Appeals</b> .....	23
1. <u>Univ. of Incarnate Word v. Redus</u> , 474 S.W.3d 816 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1594 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0732].....	23
<b>D. Texas Tort Claims Act</b> .....	24
1. <u>City of Dallas v. Sanchez</u> , 494 S.W.3d 722 (Tex. July 1, 2016) [15-0094].....	24
2. <u>Laverie v. Wetherbe</u> , S.W.3d , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 117 (Tex. Dec. 9, 2016) [15-0217].....	24
3. <u>Marino v. Lenoir</u> , 469 S.W.3d 669 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 77 (Dec. 2, 2016) [15-0610].....	25
4. <u>Sampson v. Univ. of Tex. at Austin</u> , 500 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. June 10, 2016) [14-0745].....	25

<b>E. Ultra Vires Claims</b> .....	26
1. <u>Hall v. McRaven</u> , 508 S.W.3d 232 (Tex. Jan. 27, 2017) [16-0773]..	26
2. <u>Hous. Belt &amp; Terminal Ry. Co. v. City of Houston</u> , 487 S.W.3d 154 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [14-0459]..	27
3. <u>Morath v. Sterling City Indep. Sch. Dist.</u> , 499 S.W.3d 407 (Tex. June 24, 2016) [14-0986]..	27
<b>XIII. GUARDIANSHIP</b> .....	28
<b>A. Deceased Guardians</b> .....	28
1. <u>In re Guardianship of Tonner</u> , S.W.3d , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 99 (Tex. Dec. 2, 2016) [14-0940]..	28
<b>XIV. INSURANCE</b> .....	28
<b>A. Assignment of Claims</b> .....	28
1. <u>Great Am. Ins. Co. v. Hamel</u> , 444 S.W.3d 780 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 137 (Dec. 23, 2016) [14-1007]..	28
<b>B. Bad-Faith Liability</b> .....	29
1. <u>USAA Tex. Lloyds Co. v. Menchaca</u> , 2014 WL 3804602 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1592 (Sept. 2, 2016) [14-0721]..	29
<b>C. Duty to Defend</b> .....	30
1. <u>Great Am. Ins. Co. v. Primo</u> , 455 S.W.3d 714 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1593 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0317]..	30
<b>D. Policies/Coverage</b> .....	30
1. <u>Nassar v. Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co.</u> , 508 S.W.3d 254 (Tex. Jan. 27, 2017) [15-0978]..	30
2. <u>Seger v. Yorkshire Ins. Co.</u> , 503 S.W.3d 388 (Tex. June 17, 2016) [13-0673]..	31
<b>E. Premium Finance Agreements</b> .....	31
1. <u>BankDirect Capital Fin., LLC v. Plasma Fab, LLC</u> , 468 S.W.3d 121 (Tex. App.—Austin 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1593 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0635]..	31
<b>XV. INTENTIONAL TORTS</b> .....	32
<b>A. Assault</b> .....	32
1. <u>B.C. v. Steak N Shake Operations, Inc.</u> , 461 S.W.3d 928 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 359 (Feb. 19, 2016) [15-0404]..	32
<b>B. Defamation</b> .....	33
1. <u>Brady v. Klentzman</u> , S.W.3d , 60 Tex. S. Ct. J. 272 (Tex. Jan. 27, 2017) [15-0056]..	33
2. <u>D Magazine Partners, L.P. v. Rosenthal</u> , 475 S.W. 3d 470 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1336 (June 24, 2016) [15-0790]..	33
<b>C. Malicious Prosecution</b> .....	34
1. <u>Bennett v. Grant</u> , 460 S.W.3d 220 (Tex. App.—Austin 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1593 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0338]..	34
<b>XVI. JURISDICTION</b> .....	34
<b>A. Dominant Jurisdiction</b> .....	34
1. <u>In re J.B. Hunt Transp., Inc.</u> , 492 S.W.3d 287 (Tex. May 27, 2016) [15-0631]..	34
<b>B. Injunctions</b> .....	35
1. <u>Campbell v. Wilder</u> , 487 S.W.3d 146 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [14-0379]..	35

<b>C. Personal Jurisdiction</b> .....	35
1. <u>Cornerstone Healthcare Grp. Holding, Inc. v. Nautic Mgmt. VI, L.P.</u> , 493 S.W.3d 65 (Tex. June 17, 2016) [14-0538, 14-0539]..	35
2. <u>M &amp; F Worldwide Corp. v. Pepsi-Cola Metro. Bottling Co.</u> , 453 S.W.3d 492 (Tex. App.—Houston 2014), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1336 (June 24, 2016) [15-0083]..	36
3. <u>Searcy v. Parex Res., Inc.</u> , 496 S.W.3d 58 (Tex. June 17, 2016) [14-0293, 14-0295]..	37
4. <u>TV Azteca v. Ruiz</u> , 490 S.W.3d 29 (Tex. Feb. 26, 2016) [14-0186]..	37
<b>D. Standing</b> .....	38
1. <u>Linegar v. DLA Piper LLP (US)</u> , 495 S.W.3d 276 (Tex. May 27, 2016) [14-0767]..	38
<b>XVII. MARITIME LAW</b> .....	38
<b>A. Vessel in Navigation</b> .....	38
1. <u>Helix Energy Solutions Grp., Inc. v. Gold</u> , 482 S.W.3d 638 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 30 (Oct. 21, 2016) [16-0075]..	38
<b>XVIII. MEDICAL LIABILITY</b> .....	39
<b>A. Causation</b> .....	39
1. <u>Bustamante v. Ponte</u> , 490 S.W.3d 70 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1656 (Sept. 23, 2016) [15-0509]..	39
<b>B. Expert Reports</b> .....	40
1. <u>Columbia Valley Healthcare Sys. L.P. v. Zamarripa</u> , 2015 WL 5136567 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 223 (Jan. 20, 2017) [15-0909]..	40
2. <u>Hebner v. Reddy</u> , 498 S.W.3d 37 (Tex. May 27, 2016) [14-0593]..	40
3. <u>Ransom v. Eaton</u> , 503 S.W.3d 411 (Tex. Dec. 2, 2016) [16-0079]..	41
<b>C. Health Care Liability Claims</b> .....	41
1. <u>CHRISTUS Health Gulf Coast v. Carswell</u> , 505 S.W.3d 528 (Tex. May 20, 2016) [14-0362]..	41
<b>D. Partnership Liability</b> .....	42
1. <u>Doctors Hosp. at Renaissance, Ltd. v. Andrade</u> , 493 S.W.3d 545 (Tex. May 27, 2016) [15-0563]..	42
<b>XIX. MUNICIPAL LAW</b> .....	42
<b>A. Extraterritorial Jurisdiction</b> .....	42
1. <u>Town of Lakewood Village v. Bizios</u> , 493 S.W.3d 527 (Tex. May 27, 2016) [15-0106]..	42
<b>B. State Law Preemption</b> .....	43
1. <u>BCCA Appeal Grp., Inc. v. City of Houston</u> , 496 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. Apr. 29, 2016) [13-0768]..	43
<b>XX. NEGLIGENCE</b> .....	43
<b>A. FELA Claims</b> .....	43
1. <u>Union Pac. R.R. v. Nami</u> , 498 S.W.3d 890 (Tex. June 24, 2016) [14-0901]..	43
<b>B. Independent Contractors</b> .....	44
1. <u>First Tex. Bank v. Carpenter</u> , 491 S.W.3d 729 (Tex. June 10, 2016) [15-0172]..	44

<b>C. Negligent Entrustment.</b> . . . . .	44
1. <u>4Front Engineered Solutions, Inc. v. Rosales</u> , 505 S.W.3d 905 (Tex. Dec. 23, 2016) [15-0298]. . . . .	44
<b>D. Premises Liability.</b> . . . . .	45
1. <u>Ineos USA, LLC v. Elmgren</u> , 505 S.W.3d 555 (Tex. June 17, 2016) [14-0507]. . . . .	45
2. <u>UDR Texas Props., L.P. v. Petrie</u> , S.W.3d , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 300 (Tex. Jan. 27, 2017) [15-0197]. . . . .	46
<b>E. Responsible Third Parties.</b> . . . . .	46
1. <u>Pagayon v. Exxon Mobil Corp.</u> , 467 S.W.3d 36 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1593 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0642]. . . . .	46
<b>XXI. OIL AND GAS.</b> . . . . .	47
<b>A. Assignments.</b> . . . . .	47
1. <u>Apache Deepwater, LLC v. McDaniel Partners, Ltd.</u> , 485 S.W.3d 900 (Tex. Feb. 26, 2016) [14-0546]. . . . .	47
<b>B. Common-Carrier Status.</b> . . . . .	48
1. <u>Denbury Green Pipeline-Tex., LLC v. Tex. Rice Land Partners, Ltd.</u> , S.W.3d , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 201 (Tex. Jan. 6, 2017) [15-0225]. . . . .	48
<b>C. Contract Interpretation.</b> . . . . .	48
1. <u>N. Shore Energy, L.L.C. v. Harkins</u> , 501 S.W.3d 598 (Tex. Oct. 28, 2016) [14-0552]. . . . .	48
<b>D. Indemnification Agreements.</b> . . . . .	49
1. <u>Noble Energy, Inc. v. ConocoPhillips Co.</u> , 462 S.W.3d 255 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1593 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0502]. . . . .	49
<b>E. Ownership of Oil and Gas Royalties.</b> . . . . .	49
1. <u>Wenske v. Ealy</u> , 2016 WL 363735 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2016), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 224 ( Jan. 20, 2017) [16-0353]. . . . .	49
<b>F. Pooling.</b> . . . . .	50
1. <u>Samson Exploration, LLC v. T.S. Reed Properties, Inc.</u> , 2015 WL 6295726 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 138 (Dec. 23, 2016) [15-0886]. . . . .	50
<b>G. Production in Paying Quantities.</b> . . . . .	50
1. <u>BP Am. Prod. Co. v. Laddex, Ltd.</u> , 458 S.W.3d 683 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1592 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0248]. . . . .	50
2. <u>BP Am. Prod. Co. v. Red Deer Res., LLC</u> , 466 S.W.3d 335 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1593 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0569]. . . . .	51
<b>H. Subsurface Trespass.</b> . . . . .	51
1. <u>Lightning Oil Co. v. Anadarko E&amp;P Onshore LLC</u> , 480 S.W.3d 428 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 223 (Jan. 20, 2017) [15-0910]. . . . .	51
<b>XXII. PETS.</b> . . . . .	52
<b>A. Property Rights.</b> . . . . .	52
1. <u>Lira v. Greater Hous. German Shepherd Dog Rescue, Inc.</u> , 488 S.W.3d 300 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [14-0964]. . . . .	52



<b>XXIII. PROBATE: WILLS, TRUSTS, ESTATES, &amp; GUARDIANSHIPS.</b>	52
<b>A. Tortious Interference with Inheritance Rights.</b>	52
1. <u>Kinsel v. Lindsey, 2015 WL 2085220 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2015), <i>pet. granted</i>, 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 138 (Dec. 23, 2016) [15-0403].</u>	52
<b>B. Will Construction.</b>	53
1. <u>Hudson v. Ard, 2015 WL 4967045 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2015), <i>pet. granted</i>, 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 222 (Jan. 20, 2017) [15-0705].</u>	53
2. <u>Stephens v. Beard, 485 S.W.3d 914 (Tex. Mar. 18, 2016) [14-0406, 14-0407].</u>	53
<b>XXIV. PROCEDURE—APPELLATE.</b>	53
<b>A. Dismissal.</b>	53
1. <u>Brown v. Jones, 494 S.W.3d 727 (Tex. July 1, 2016) [15-0419].</u>	53
2. <u>Ex Parte N.C., 486 S.W.3d 560 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [15-0184].</u>	54
3. <u>McLean v. Livingston, 486 S.W.3d 561 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [15-0100].</u>	54
<b>XXV. PROCEDURE—PRETRIAL.</b>	55
<b>A. Certificates of Merit.</b>	55
1. <u>Melden &amp; Hunt, Inc. v. East Rio Hondo Water Supply Corp., 2015 WL 9259257 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2015), <i>pet. granted</i>, 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 246 (Jan. 20, 2017) [16-0078].</u>	55
<b>B. Discovery.</b>	55
1. <u>In re CHRISTUS Santa Rosa Health Sys., 492 S.W.3d 279 (Tex. May 27, 2016) [14-1077].</u>	55
2. <u>In re City of Dallas, 501 S.W.3d 71 (Tex. Sept. 30, 2016) [15-0794].</u>	56
3. <u>In re H.E.B. Grocery Co., L.P., 492 S.W.3d 300 (Tex. May 27, 2016) [15-0625].</u>	56
4. <u>In re Keenan, 501 S.W.3d 74 (Tex. Sept. 30, 2016) [15-0777].</u>	57
5. <u>In re M-I L.L.C., 505 S.W.3d 569 (Tex. May 20, 2016) [14-1045].</u>	57
6. <u>In re Nat’l Lloyds Ins. Co., 507 S.W.3d 219 (Tex. Oct. 28, 2016) [15-0452].</u>	58
7. <u>Pederal Energy, LLC v. Bruington Eng’g, LLC, 456 S.W.3d 181 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2014), <i>pet. granted</i>, 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 940 (May 27, 2016) [15-0123].</u>	59
<b>C. Forum Non Conveniens.</b>	59
1. <u>In re Oceanografia, S.A. de C.V., 494 S.W.3d 728 (Tex. July 1, 2016) [14-0963].</u>	59
<b>D. Forum Selection Clauses.</b>	60
1. <u>In re Nationwide Ins. Co. of Am., 494 S.W.3d 708 (Tex. June 24, 2016) [15-0328].</u>	60
<b>E. Pre-suit Discovery.</b>	60
1. <u>In re DePinho, 505 S.W.3d 621 (Tex. May 20, 2016) [15-0294].</u>	60
<b>F. Statute of Limitations.</b>	61
1. <u>ExxonMobil Corp. v. Lazy R Ranch, L.P., 456 S.W.3d 332 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2015), <i>pet. granted</i>, 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1592 (Sept. 5, 2016) [15-0270].</u>	61
<b>G. Venue.</b>	61
1. <u>In re Red Dot Building System, Inc., 504 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. Dec. 2, 2016) [15-1007].</u>	61
<b>XXVI. PROCEDURE—TRIAL AND POST-TRIAL.</b>	62
<b>A. New Trial Orders.</b>	62
1. <u>In re Bent, 487 S.W.3d 170 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [14-1006].</u>	62

2. <u>United Scaffolding, Inc. v. Levine</u> , 2015 WL 5157837 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 138 (Dec. 23, 2016) [15-0921].....	62
<b>B. Post-Judgment Filing Deadlines.</b> .....	63
1. <u>In re Heredia</u> , 501 S.W.3d 70 (Tex. Sept. 30, 2016) [16-0270]..	63
2. <u>In re J.Z.P.</u> , 484 S.W.3d 924 (Tex. Feb. 26, 2016) [14-1072].....	63
<b>XXVII. PRODUCTS LIABILITY</b> .....	63
<b>A. Indemnity</b> .....	63
1. <u>Centerpoint Builders GP, LLC v. Trussway, Ltd.</u> , 496 S.W.3d 33 (Tex. June 17, 2016) [14-0650].....	63
<b>XXVIII. REAL PROPERTY</b> .....	64
<b>A. Eminent Domain</b> .....	64
1. <u>Caffe Ribs, Inc. v. State</u> , 487 S.W.3d 137 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [14-0193]..	64
2. <u>In re Lazy W Dist. No. 1</u> , 493 S.W.3d 538 (Tex. May 27, 2016) [15-0117].....	64
<b>B. Landlord Tenant</b> .....	65
1. <u>Phila. Indem. Ins. Co. v. White</u> , 490 S.W.3d 468 (Tex. May 13, 2016) [14-0086]..	65
<b>C. Lis Pendens</b> .....	66
1. <u>Sommers v. Sandcastle Homes, Inc.</u> , 469 S.W.3d 173 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 137 (Dec. 23, 2016) [15-0847], <i>consolidated with Sommers v. NewBiss Property, LP</i> , 469 S.W.3d 173 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 137 (Dec. 23, 2016) [15-0848]..	66
<b>D. Nuisance</b> .....	66
1. <u>Atmos Energy Corp. v. Town of DISH</u> , 2015 WL 3463490 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 222 (Jan. 20, 2017) [15-0613].....	66
2. <u>Crosstex N. Tex. Pipeline, L.P. v. Gardiner</u> , 505 S.W.3d 580 (Tex. June 24, 2016) [15-0049].....	66
<b>XXIX. TAXES</b> .....	67
<b>A. Cigarette Tax</b> .....	67
1. <u>Hegar v. Tex. Small Tobacco Coal.</u> , 496 S.W.3d 778 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [14-0747].....	67
<b>B. Franchise Tax</b> .....	68
1. <u>Hallmark Mktg. Co. v. Hegar</u> , 488 S.W.3d 795 (Tex. Apr. 15, 2016) [14-1075]...	68
<b>C. Property Tax</b> .....	68
1. <u>ETC Mktg., Ltd. v. Harris Cty. Appraisal Dist.</u> , 476 S.W.3d 501 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1594 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0687].....	68
2. <u>Valero Ref. - Tex., L.P. v. Galveston Cent. Appraisal Dist.</u> , 463 S.W.3d 177 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1593 (Sept. 2, 2016) [15-0492].....	69
<b>D. Sales Tax</b> .....	69
1. <u>Sw. Royalties, Inc. v. Hegar</u> , 500 S.W.3d 400 (Tex. June 17, 2016) [14-0743].....	69
<b>XXX. TEXAS CITIZENS PARTICIPATION ACT</b> .....	70
<b>A. Actual Malice</b> .....	70
1. <u>Greer v. Abraham</u> , 489 S.W.3d 440 (Tex. Apr. 15, 2016) [14-0669].....	70
<b>B. Attorney’s Fees</b> .....	70
1. <u>Sullivan v. Abraham</u> , 488 S.W.3d 294 (Tex. Apr. 15, 2016) [14-0987].....	70

<b>C. Dismissal Standard.</b> .....	71
1. <u>KBMT Operating Co. v. Toledo</u> , 492 S.W.3d 710 (Tex. June 17, 2016) [14-0456]..	71
<b>D. Initial Burden.</b> .....	72
1. <u>Hersh v. Tatum</u> , 493 S.W.3d 675 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2015), <i>pet. granted</i> , 60 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 224 (Jan. 20, 2017) [16-0096]..	72
<b>XXXI. TEXAS UNIFORM FRAUDULENT TRANSFER ACT.</b> .....	72
<b>A. Reasonably Equivalent Value.</b> .....	72
1. <u>Janvey v. The Golf Channel, Inc.</u> , 487 S.W.3d 560 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [15-0489]..	72
<b>XXXII. TIM COLE ACT.</b> .....	73
<b>A. Child Support Compensation.</b> .....	73
1. <u>In re Phillips</u> , 496 S.W.3d 769 (Tex. May 13, 2016) [14-0797]..	73
<b>XXXIII. WATER LAW.</b> .....	74
<b>A. Accommodation Doctrine.</b> .....	74
1. <u>Coyote Lake Ranch, LLC v. City of Lubbock</u> , 498 S.W.3d 53 (Tex. May 27, 2016) [14-0572]..	74
<b>XXXIV. WORKERS' COMPENSATION.</b> .....	74
<b>A. Independent Contractors.</b> .....	74
1. <u>TIC Energy &amp; Chem., Inc. v. Martin</u> , 498 S.W.3d 68 (Tex. June 3, 2016) [15-0143]..	74
<b>B. Settlement Agreements.</b> .....	75
1. <u>Tex. Dep't of Ins. v. Jones</u> , 498 S.W.3d 610 (Tex. June 24, 2016) [15-0025]..	75

**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 February 1, 2016 through January 31, 2017. Petitions granted but not yet decided are also included.

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW**

**A. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies**

1. Clint Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Marquez, 487 S.W.3d 538 (Tex. Apr. 1, 2016) [14-0903].

At issue in this case was whether a group of parents was required to exhaust administrative remedies under the Texas Education Code before filing suit in a trial court seeking declaratory and injunctive relief to cure alleged inequalities in funding among individual schools in the Clint Independent School District.

Parents of students attending schools in Clint ISD filed suit against the school district, claiming it violated the Texas Education Code because it was inequitably funding the schools within the district. They also raised claims of a violation of the equal rights and education provisions of the Texas Constitution. Clint ISD responded by filing a motion to dismiss and a plea to the jurisdiction. The trial court granted Clint ISD's motions, explaining that the Parents failed to exhaust all administrative remedies prior to filing suit. The case was appealed to the court of appeals, which reversed the trial court's ruling. The court of appeals held that the Parents validly raised constitutional claims, which are exempt from the requirement that a party exhaust all administrative remedies prior to filing suit. Clint ISD appealed, arguing that the school district's obligation to fund schools arises from the Texas Education Code instead of the Constitution, thus the Parents failed to raise a valid constitutional claim.

The Court held that the Parents' claims necessarily involved violations of the "school laws of the state" and that the Parents were required to exhaust their administrative remedies. The

Constitution provides that it is the Legislature's duty to provide for an efficient public school system. And through the Education Code, the Legislature, not the Constitution, imposed the legal obligations on the school district that the parents claimed the district failed to meet.

The Court further held that the Parents were not excused from exhausting administrative remedies under any exceptions. Claims for purely constitutional violations do not require exhaustion of administrative remedies, but the Parents' constitutional claims necessarily resulted from alleged violations of the school laws of the state. The constitutional-claims exception did not therefore apply.

Section 7.057(a-1) of the Education Code excepts claims based on law "outside" of the Code. The Court held that this exception did not apply because the Parents' claims were based on provisions in the Education Code. The Court also held that the Parents' request for temporary injunctive relief did not except their claims from the exhaustion requirement because such relief was not appropriate in this case. Lastly, although "pure questions of law" are excepted from the exhaustion requirement, the Parents presented questions of historical fact, questions of law, and mixed questions of law and fact.

Although the Parents requested that the Court remand to the trial court so that they could amend their pleadings to cure the jurisdictional defect, the Court held that the Parents could not replead their claims in such a way as to eliminate their reliance on the school laws of the state. The Parents could also not use remand as a mechanism to plead new claims. The Court therefore dismissed the suit for lack of jurisdiction.

2. McIntyre v. El Paso Indep. Sch. Dist., 499 S.W.3d 820 (Tex. June 24, 2016) [14-0732].

At issue in this case was whether the Texas Education Code required a homeschooling family

to exhaust administrative remedies before suing El Paso Independent School District for violation of certain constitutional rights. The McIntyre family sued the District and its attendance officer after criminal charges were filed against them for truancy and contributing to truancy. They asserted the charges resulted from their refusal to sign the District's homeschool verification form rather than from criminal conduct, and brought suit alleging violations of their state and federal constitutional rights. The district court denied the District's plea to the jurisdiction. The court of appeals, however, reversed, reasoning that the Education Code required the McIntyres to exhaust administrative remedies before suing the District for violations of their rights under the Texas Constitution. It also held that qualified immunity protected the District's attendance officer from the McIntyres' claims. The Supreme Court reversed in part, holding the McIntyres need not exhaust administrative remedies.

The Court held that the Education Code did not require the McIntyres to exhaust administrative remedies before suing the District for violation of their rights under the Texas Constitution. Employment disputes aside, the Code limits administrative appeals to cases where a person is aggrieved by the school laws or a school board's violation of them. Here, the McIntyres were not aggrieved by the school laws; their grievance was with the District's actions. Neither were the McIntyres aggrieved by a violation of the school laws; they alleged the District violated the constitution, not the Education Code. Accordingly, the Court reversed the court of appeals' judgment insofar as it dismissed the McIntyres' claims for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. The Court, however, affirmed the court of appeals' judgment to the extent it dismissed the McIntyres' claims against the District's attendance officer based on qualified immunity. The Court remanded the case to the court of appeals.

Justice Green, joined by Justice Johnson and Justice Brown, dissented. The dissent concluded that the Education Code required the McIntyres to exhaust administrative remedies. The McIntyres necessarily alleged they were aggrieved by the school laws when they challenged the District's and its attendance officer's investigation and the

actions taken pursuant to the school laws. Further, the McIntyres asserted the District and its attendance officer acted outside the scope of their authority, which means that the District violated the school laws. The Education Code requires exhaustion of administrative remedies when a plaintiff's claim requires a determination of a school district's authority in administering the school laws.

#### **B. Public Information Act**

1. Paxton v. City of Dallas, 453 S.W.3d 580 (Tex. App.—Austin 2014), *pet. granted*, 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 359 (Feb. 19, 2016) [15-0073], *consolidated with*, Paxton v. City of Dallas, 2015 WL 601974 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2015), *pet. granted*, 59 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 359 (Feb. 19, 2016) [15-0238].

The primary issue in these consolidated cases is whether attorney-client privilege permits a governmental entity to withhold privileged documents from public disclosure under the Texas Public Information Act (PIA). Subject to certain exceptions for confidential information, the PIA requires that public information be made available to the public upon request. If a governmental entity desires to withhold the requested information from disclosure, it must request an opinion from the Attorney General on the issue no later than 10 business days after receiving the request. If the governmental entity fails to timely comply, the requested information is "presumed to be subject to required public disclosure and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information."

In two cases, the City of Dallas received information requests that allegedly would require disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege. The City failed to ask the Attorney General for an opinion within 10 business days of receiving the requests. When the City finally requested an Attorney General opinion, the City asserted attorney-client privilege as the "compelling reason" that permits the City to nonetheless withhold the information from public disclosure. The Attorney General disagreed, concluding that the PIA required disclosure. The City sued the Attorney General, arguing that it had satisfied the compelling-reason standard. After the City won in one trial court and lost in another, the two courts of appeals in these cases held 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: Texas Supreme Court Update

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2017 eConference on State and Federal Appeals](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
27<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals session  
"Texas Supreme Court Update"