

# The Common Law is Not Dead

*University of Texas*  
*27th Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals*

June 1-2, 2017

David Keltner

david.keltner@kellyhart.com



## **It's about causation – stupid!**

- Since January 1, 2017 the Supreme Court has issued several causation cases. These cases are not only important in their own right, but give us a window into past cases to which the Court continually refers.

## Proximate cause = “cause in fact” + “foreseeability”

In an unbroken line of cases, the Supreme Court recognizes that an act, omission or breach is a *proximate cause* of an injury if the breach was (1) a *cause in fact* of the harm, and (2) the injury was *foreseeable*.

*Stanfield v. Neubaum*, 494 S.W.3d 90, 97 (Tex. 2016).

*HMC Hotel Props. II Ltd. P’ship v. Keystone-Texas Prop. Holding Corp.*, 439 S.W.3d 910, 913 (Tex. 2014).

3

## Cause in fact

- Cause in fact requires the act, omission, or breach to be a *substantial factor* in bringing about the harm; and
- *But for* the act, omission or breach, the harm would not occur.
- In other words, *substantial factor* and *but for causation* are both necessary to prove *cause in fact*.

*HMC Hotel Props. II Ltd. P’ship v. Keystone-Texas Prop. Holding Corp.*, 439 S.W.3d 910, 913 (Tex. 2014).

4

## **New and independent/ *superseding cause v. concurring cause***

- A new and independent cause “destroys” the causal connection between the act, omission or duty and the eventual harm.
- On the other hand, concurring cause continues the harm caused by the first act, omission or breach.

*Stanfield v. Neubaum*, 494 S.W.3d 90, 98 (Tex. 2016).

5

## **Judicial error = new, independent and intervening cause**

*Stanfield v. Neubaum*, 494 S.W.3d 90 (Tex. 2016)

- A legal malpractice case dealing with litigation conduct in an underlying usury case.
- The defense lawyers raised the defenses of (1) *bona fide* error and (2) a usury cure-letter.
- Neither defense was raised at trial.
- Instead, the defense lawyers argued that the person who made the loan was not the agent of their defendant-client.
- After an unfortunate verdict, the defendant-client sued the lawyers for failing to raise the *bona fide* error and usury cure-letter defenses.
- In the meantime, a new lawyer appealed the adverse judgment.
- The court of appeals reversed the agency finding and held that no agency existed as a matter of law—rendering judgment for the defendant-client.
- Nonetheless, the client continued the malpractice claim by claiming that the appeal would not have been necessary if the *bona fide* error and the usury cure-letter defenses had been raised.

6

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 Common Law Is Not Dead

Also available as part of the eCourse

[Texas Appellate Law Hot Topics: The Common Law, Statutory Interpretation, Malpractice, and More](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
27<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals session  
"The Common Law Is Not Dead"