

PRESENTED AT

The University of Texas School of Law
Administrative and Public Law Section of the State Bar of Texas
13th Annual
Advanced Texas
Administrative Law Seminar

August 16-17, 2018
Austin, TX

Case Law Updates

presented by
Jennifer L. Hopgood

Author Contact Information:
Jennifer L. Hopgood
jennifer.hopgood@oag.texas.gov
Austin, TX

Administrative Case Law Update

Presented by:

Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal

Texas Tech University School of Law

1802 Hartford Avenue

Lubbock, Texas 79410

alj.law@ttu.edu

SPEAKER

Jennifer L. Hopgood

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

(Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal Editors, Vol. 19, Book 2)

Andrew C. Smith
Editor in Chief

Maira L. Gonzalez-Sanchez
Executive Managing Editor

Joseph S. Ellis
Executive Business Manager

Abbey B. Coufal
Executive Articles Editor

Matt Joeckel
Org. Development Chair

Sarah Kline
Comment Editor

Allie Winkle
Comment Editor

Brandon Callahan
Article Editor

Taylor Guerrero
Article Editor

Janet Moreno
Article Editor

Mario G. Perez
Article Editor

Camilo Valencia
Article Editor

Kiley Aycock
Staff Editor

Kasey Chester
Staff Editor

Matthew Frost
Staff Editor

Miguel Hernandez
Staff Editor

David Hutchens
Staff Editor

Mason Leal
Staff Editor

Weston Mumme
Staff Editor

Taylor Nichols
Staff Editor

Maria Oviedo
Staff Editor

Elliott O'Day
Staff Editor

Holton Westbrook
Staff Editor

The University of Texas at Austin
13th Annual Advanced Texas Administrative Law Seminar
August 16-17, 2018
Austin, Texas

Speaker Biographies

Jennifer L. Hopgood

Jennifer Hopgood is an assistant attorney general in the Financial Litigation and Charitable Trusts Division of the Office of the Attorney General of Texas. She represents the State of Texas in litigation, including bond validation matters, and various agencies including the Department of Insurance and the Comptroller of Public Accounts in insurance and financial litigation. Jennifer also served as a staff attorney for the Honorable Bob Pemberton at the Third Court of Appeals.

Prior to her legal career, Jennifer taught for eleven years in the Eanes school district, primarily teaching sixth grade English.

Jennifer received her B.A. in Japanese studies from the University of California, Berkeley and her J.D. from the University of Houston Law Center. She serves on the board of the Austin Bar Association's Administrative Law Section as Treasurer and was a CLE co-chair for three years. Jennifer also serves on the board of the Travis County Women Lawyer's Association.

Of note and disclaimer: none of the summaries are or should be considered the opinion of the Texas Attorney General. The summaries are for informational purposes only.

Student Author Biographies

λ **Andrew Caleb Smith**, J.D./MBA Candidate 2018, is the Editor-In-Chief of Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. Andrew grew up in Provo, Utah and is the proud father of four daughters. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Brigham Young University, majoring in International Relations. He also holds a Master of Education degree from Southern Methodist University. He is the president of the J.

Reuben Clark Law Society. He is interested in education law and alternative dispute resolution.

£ **Maira Lizett Gonzalez-Sanchez**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is the Executive Managing Editor for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. She was born and raised in the Rio Grande Valley. In 2012, she

graduated magna cum laude from Texas A&M University majoring in Political Science and minoring in Sociology. She was the American Bar Association 13th Circuit Lt. Governor of the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) Program and a member of the Phi Delta Phi legal honor society. Her legal interests include civil litigation, income tax, family, and criminal law.

⌘ **Abbey B. Coufal**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is the Executive Articles Editor for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. She was born and raised in Vernon, Texas. She received her Bachelor of Arts from West Texas A&M University in 2014, majoring in Mass Communication with an emphasis on Advertising/Public Relations and Broadcast Journalism. Her primary legal interests include water, environmental, and oil & gas law.

Δ **Matt Joeckel**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is the Executive of Organizational Development for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. He was born and raised in Arlington, Texas. He received his Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing from Texas A&M University and a Masters of Liberal Arts from Texas Christian University. He is primarily interested in civil litigation.

α **Joseph S. (“Joe”) Ellis**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is the Executive Business Manager for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. He was born in San Angelo and raised in Brownwood, Texas. Joe received his Bachelors of Science from the United States Air Force Academy (2008) where he graduated on the Dean’s List. He earned his Masters of Arts with an Emphasis in International Relations from the University of Oklahoma (2013). He served as an Intelligence Officer in the United States Air Force for over seven years and served multiple tours overseas and combat deployments. He is primarily interested in criminal litigation, military law, and administrative law.

Ξ **Sarah Kline**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is a Comment Editor for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. Sarah is from Paradise, Texas, and graduated from Bridgeport

High School in 2011. She then went on to Texas Christian University, where she double majored in English and Political Science and graduated cum laude in 2014. She is interested in intellectual property and energy law.

⏏ **Allie Winkle**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is a Comment Editor for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. She grew up in Coppel, Texas and graduated from the University of Texas at Austin where she majored in Sport Management. Allie served as the Vice President of the Organization of Women Law Students and a Longhorn Bar Association member. Her primary legal interest is civil litigation.

φ **Brandon Callahan**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is an Articles Editor for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. He grew up in Sandy, Utah and received a Bachelors of Science degree in Business Administration from Brigham Young University-Idaho. After graduating from college, he worked at a brokerage until deciding to go to law school. Brandon is interested in estate planning, as well as, civil litigation, and hopes to practice both.

Λ **Taylor Guerrero**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is an Articles Editor for Volume 19 of the Texas Administrative Law Journal. She was raised in White Deer, Texas, but the coaching life took her to many different towns: Seymour, Breckenridge, and Van Vleck, and Austin. She received a Bachelor of Arts in History and Government from the University of Texas in Austin, Texas. She was involved in the Hispanic Law Student Association and the Longhorn Bar Association, as well as a member of Phi Delta Phi, a legal honor society. Her legal interests include human rights, specifically human trafficking, and becoming a federal prosecutor.

ψ **Janet Moreno**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is an Articles Editor for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. She was born in Midland, Texas. In May 2015, Janet graduated magna cum laude from Texas Tech University majoring in Journalism and Political Science. Janet was on the Pro Bono Board of Directors and

a member of the Hispanic Law Student Association. She has a strong interest in criminal law and hopes to become a prosecutor.

π **Mario G. Perez, Jr.**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is an Articles Editor for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. Although he was born in Laredo, Texas, he was raised in both Laredo, Texas and Nuevo Laredo, Mexico. He graduated magna cum laude from Texas Tech University, double majoring in History and Political Science. His legal interests include municipal law, administrative law, civil litigation, and immigration law.

⌘ **Camilo Valencia**, J.D. Candidate 2018, is an Articles Editor for Volume 19 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. Although he was born in Medellin, Colombia. He spent his formative years in Garland, Texas. In May 2015, he graduated with a Bachelor of Arts from Austin College, majoring in Economics and Political Science. He is interested in civil litigation.

¥ **Kiley Aycock**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is the Editor-in-Chief for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. She grew up in Lubbock, Texas and graduated from the University of Texas at Austin where she majored in International Relations and Global Studies. She is primarily interested in civil litigation.

θ **Kasey Chester**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is an Article Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. She grew up in Midland, Texas, and attended Texas Christian University where she received a Bachelor of Science in Political Science in 2016. Kasey currently serves as the Fundraising Chair for the Criminal Law Association, is a member of the National Mock Trial Team, and is involved in many other organizations on campus. She has a strong interest in civil litigation, international law, as well as business and commercial law.

v **Matthew Frost**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is an Articles Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. He grew up in Boerne, Texas and received his Bachelor of Arts in English with a concentration in Professional

Writing from the University of Texas-San Antonio in 2015. He is a dual degree student in the Juris Doctor/ Master of Science in Personal Financial Planning program. His legal interests include estate planning, retirement law, and civil litigation. He hopes to practice in one of these areas, hopefully combining his legal interests with his interest in personal financial planning.

ς **Miguel Hernandez**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is a Comment Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. He is a native of Lubbock, Texas, and received his Bachelor of Science degree in Chemical Engineering from Texas Tech University. He is currently employed at the Office of Research Commercialization at Texas Tech University as an Intellectual Property Analyst, where he completes patentability assessments of research done at the university. He is interested in intellectual property law, energy law, and products liability.

μ **David M. Hutchens**, J.D. Candidate for 2019, is an Articles Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. He was born in Plano and raised in Lubbock, Texas. David received his Bachelors of Arts from Texas Tech University (2011). His primary legal interests include water, oil & gas, and civil litigation.

Χ **Mason Leal**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is the Business Manager for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. He is from Austin, Texas, but traveled to Dallas for college. In December 2014, Mason received his Bachelor of Science from the University of Texas at Dallas majoring in Supply Chain Management. His legal interests include immigration, criminal, and tort law.

© **Weston Mumme**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is an Articles Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. He was born and raised in Austin, Texas. Weston received his Bachelor of Arts and Science in History from Texas Tech University in 2014. He is primarily interested in criminal defense.

β **Taylor Nichols**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is a Comment Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas

Tech Administrative Law Journal. She grew up in Petersburg, a very small town northeast of Lubbock. She received her Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing from Texas Tech University in 2014. Taylor currently serves as the Torts Tutor for Professor Cochran, Vice President of the Christian Legal Society, and is a member of the Organization of Women Law Students. Her primary legal interest is civil litigation.

★**Elliott O’Day**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is the Executive Comment Editor and Case Law Update Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. Although he was born in Dallas, TX, his hometown is Fort Worth, TX. He graduated cum laude from Baylor University with a Bachelor of Arts in Film & Digital Media. His primary areas of interest are administrative law, alternative dispute resolution, estate planning, and family law.

η **María Oviedo**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is an Article Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. María was born in San Miguel de Allende, GTO, Mexico, and moved to Granbury, Texas at the age of seven. She graduated Magna Cum Laude from Texas

Tech University with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and a Bachelor of Arts in Spanish. María is the current president of the Immigration Law Association, and her primary interest is immigration law.

Σ “**Andrew” Travis Smith**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is an Article Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. He is from San Antonio, Texas and received his Bachelor of Arts with Highest Honors from Texas Tech University in 2016, majoring in Honors Arts and Letters with minors in Legal Studies and Philosophy. He is primarily interested in estate planning, administrative law, and civil litigation.

δ **Holton Westbrook**, J.D. Candidate 2019, is the Executive Managing Editor for Volume 20 of the Texas Tech Administrative Law Journal. Holton was born and raised in Stephenville, Texas, the Cowboy Capital of the World. He attended Texas Tech University where he received a Bachelor of Science in Agricultural and Applied Economics, graduating Summa Cum Laude with Highest Honors. Holton’s legal interests include agriculture, energy, business, and water law.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	8
II. Agency Authority	8
<i>Swate v. Tex. Med. Bd.</i> , No. 03-15-00815-CV, 2017 WL 3902621, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 8291 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 31, 2017, pet. filed). ⌘	8
<i>Graphic Packaging Corp. v. Hegar</i> , 538 S.W.3d 89 (Tex. 2017). β.....	9
<i>Morath v. Progreso Indep. Sch. Dist.</i> , No. 03-16-00254-CV, 2017 WL 6273192, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 11329 (Tex. App.—Dec. 7, 2017, no pet.) (mem. op.). δ	10
<i>In Re Accident Fund Gen. Ins.</i> , No. 16-0556, 2017 WL 639142, 2017 Tex. LEXIS 1152 (Tex. Dec. 15, 2017) (per curiam). ★	11
<i>EXLP Leasing, LLC v. Galveston Cent. Appraisal Dist.</i> , No. 15-0683, 2018 WL 1122363, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 261 (Tex. Mar. 2, 2018). Χ.....	12

<i>Willacy Cnty. Appraisal Dist. v. Sebastian Cotton & Grain, Ltd.</i> , NO. 16-0626, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 351, 2018 WL 1974485 (Tex. Apr. 27, 2018). ¥	13
<i>Banda v. Tex. Bd. of Nursing</i> , NO. 13-16-0036, 2018 WL 2371641, 2018 Tex. App. LEXIS 3698 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi May-Edinburg May 24, 2018, no pet.). μ	14
III. Agency Interpretation of Statutes and Rules	15
<i>Beauty Basics Inc. v. Tex. Dep't of Licensing & Regulation</i> , No. 03-17-00118-CV, 2017 WL 3996396, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 8474 (Tex. --App.—Austin Sep. 7, 2017, no pet.). α	15
<i>GEO Group, Inc. v. Hegar</i> , No. 03-15-00726-CV, 2017 WL 3471057, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 7559 (Tex. App—Austin Aug. 10, 2017, pet. filed) (mem. op.). Χ	15
<i>New World Car Nissan, Inc. v. Tex. Dep't of Motor Vehicles</i> , No. 03-16-00237-CV, 2017 WL 4766592, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 9852 (Tex. App.—Austin Oct. 20, 2017, no pet.). π	16
<i>Perez v. Physician Assistant Bd.</i> , No. 03-16-00732-CV, 2017 WL 5078003, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 10154 (Tex. App—Austin Oct. 31, 2017, pet. denied)	17
<i>Physician Assistant Bd. v. Perez</i> , No. 03-16-00840-CV, 2017 WL 5078141, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 10155 (Tex. App—Austin Oct. 31, 2017, no pet.). Δ	17
<i>AC Interests, L.P., v. Tex. Comm'n on Envtl. Quality</i> , No. 16-0260, 2018 WL 1440145, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 252 (Tex. Mar. 23, 2018). Θ	18
<i>Boyd, J., dissenting.</i>	19
<i>Tex. Workforce Comm'n v. Wichita Cnty.</i> , No. 17-0130, 2018 WL 2375140, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 443 (Tex. 2018). Σ	19
<i>Neighborhood Ctrs., Inc. v. Walker</i> , 544 S.W.3d 744 (Tex. Apr. 13, 2018) (orig. proceeding). θ	20
<i>Sullivan v. Tex. Ethics Comm'n</i> , No. 03-17-00392-CV, 2018 WL 2248275, 2018 Tex. App. LEXIS 3462 (Tex. App.—Austin May. 17, 2018, no pet.). Σ	21
<i>Fort Worth Transp. Auths. v. Rodriguez</i> , NO. 16-0542, 2018 WL 1976712, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 370 (Tex. April 27, 2018). μ	22
<i>In re Xerox Corp.</i> , No. 16-0671, 2018 WL 3077704, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 615 (Tex. 2018). Σ	22
IV. Discovery	23
<i>Allibone v. Freshour</i> , No. 03-17-00357-CV, 2017 WL 5663607, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 10884 (Tex. App—Austin Nov. 21, 2017, no pet.). ©	23
V. Due Process	24
<i>Morath v. Cano</i> , No. 03-15-0799-CV, 2017 WL 3585252, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 7784 (Tex. App—Austin Aug. 17, 2017, no pet.). ©	24
<i>N.T. v. Tex. Dep't of Family and Protective Servs.</i> , No. 03-17-00573-CV, 2017 WL 5985507, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 11024 (Tex. App.—Austin Nov. 29, 2017, no pet.). ж	25
<i>Tex. Alcoholic Beverage Comm'n v. Live Oak Brewing Co., LLC</i> , 537 S.W.3d 647 (Tex. App.—Austin Dec. 15, 2017, pet. filed)	25

VI. Jurisdiction	26
A. Sovereign Immunity	26
<i>Reagan Nat'l Advert. of Austin, Inc., v. Bass</i> , No. 03-16-00320-CV, 2017 WL 4348181, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 9049, (Tex. App.—Austin, Sept. 27, 2017, no pet.). Λ.....	26
<i>Smith v. Dist. Att’y’s Office for Smith Cty.</i> , No. 03–16–00828–CV, 2017 WL 3902615, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 8032 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 23, 2017, no pet.). ★	27
<i>Tex. v. Austin</i> , No. 03-17-00131-CV, 2017 WL 4136173, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 8605 (Tex. App.—Austin Sept. 12, 2017, no pet.). £	27
<i>Tex. State Univ. v. Quinn</i> , No. 03-16-00548-CV, 2017 WL 5985500, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 11025 (Tex. App.—Austin Nov. 29, 2017, no pet.). λ	28
<i>Univ. of Tex. Health Sci. Ctr. at Hous. v. Rios</i> , No. 16-0836, 2017 WL 6396028, 2017 Tex. LEXIS 1151 (Tex. Dec. 15, 2017). Ψ	29
<i>Borunda Holdings, Inc. v. Lake Proctor Irrigation Auth.</i> , No. 17-0107, 2018 WL 1021394, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 166, (Tex. Feb. 23, 2018). V	29
<i>Wasson Interests, Ltd. v. City of Jacksonville</i> , 17-0198, 2018 WL 2449184, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 514 (Tex. Jun. 1, 2018). Χ	30
<i>City of Houston v. Houston Emp’t Pension Sys.</i> , 2018 WL 2749728, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 523 (Tex. Jun. 8, 2018). δ.....	31
<i>Hegar v. CHZP</i> , 2018 WL 3150839, 2018 Tex. App. LEXIS 4803 (Tex.App.—Austin Jun. 28, 2018). ¥.....	32
<i>Tex. ex rel. Best v. Harper</i> , 2018 WL 3207125, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 659 (Tex. Jun. 29, 2018). ¥.....	33
B. Prerequisites to Suits	34
<i>OGCI Training Inc. v. Hegar</i> , 03-16-00704-CV, 2017 WL 4899015, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 10096 (Tex. App.—Austin Oct. 27, 2017, no pet.). ж	34
C. Exhaustion of Remedies.....	34
<i>In re Murphy & Beane, Inc. and Viacom, Inc.</i> , No. 03–16–00690–CV, 2017 WL 3897453, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 8215 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 29, 2017, no pet.). η.....	34
D. Standing	35
<i>Meyers v. JDC/Firethorne, Ltd.</i> , 2018 WL 2749769, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 522 (Tex. Jun. 8, 2018). Χ35	
E. Right to Judicial Review	36
<i>Office of the Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Pakse, Inc.</i> , No. 13-16-00121-CV, 2017 WL 4583213, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 9461 (Tex. App.—Austin Oct. 10, 2017, no pet.) (mem. op.). Ξ..	36
<i>Risoli v. Bd. of Adjustment of City of Wimberley</i> , No. 03-17-00384-CV, 2017 WL 4766724, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 9851 (Tex. App.—Austin Oct. 20, 2017, no pet.). λ.....	37
F. Ultra Vires	37
<i>In re C.Y.K.S.</i> , No. 17-0214, 2018 WL 2749800, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 518 (Tex. 2018). Σ	37
<i>Honor's Acad., Inc. v. Tex. Educ. Agency</i> , NO. 16–0519, WL 1975025, LEXIS 371 (Apr. 27, 2018). ★	38
<i>Roach v. Ingram</i> , NO. 14-16-00790-CV, NO. 14-16-01016-CV, 2018 WL 2672546, LEXIS 3982 (Tex.—Houston 2018) (mem. op.). ★	40
VII. Motions for Rehearing	41

Fisher v. Pub. Util. Comm'n of Tex., No. 03-16-00540-CV, 2018 WL 454730, 2018 Tex. App. LEXIS 283 (Tex. App.—Austin Jan. 11, 2018, no pet.). λ.....41

VIII. Open Government: Public Information Act & Open Meetings Act.....42

Reger v. Att’y Gen., No. 03-17-00306-CV, 2017 WL 5559939, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 10828 (Tex. App.—Austin Nov. 17, 2017, pet. denied) (mem. op.). α42

Paxton v. Tex. Health & Human Servs. Comm'n, No. 03-15-00652-CV, 2017 WL 6504084, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 11591 (Tex. App.—Austin Dec. 14, 2017, pet. filed.). Ϡ42

Bourland, J., Dissenting43

IX. Orders.....43

Almeter v. Bastrop Cent. Appraisal Dist., No. 03-17-00092-CV, 2017 WL 4478217, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 9345 (Tex. App.—Austin Oct. 5, 2017, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Δ43

Mountain Peak Special Util. Dist. v. Pub. Util. Comm'n of Tex., 03-16-00796-CV, 2017 WL 5078034, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 10261, (Tex. App.—Austin Nov. 2, 2017, pet. filed). φ44

X. Rules.....45

G & A Outsourcing IV, L.L.C. v. Tex. Workforce Comm'n, No. 03-16-00752-CV, 2017 WL 3585219, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 7785 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 17, 2017, no pet.). β.....45

Tex. Alcoholic Beverage Comm'n v. Mark Anthony Brewing, Inc., No. 03-16-00039-CV, 2017 WL 4582848, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 9626 (Tex. App.—Austin Oct. 13, 2017, no pet.). ψ46

Jaguar Land Rover N. Am. v. Bd. of Tex. Dept. of Motor Vehicles, No. 03-16-00770-CV, 2017 WL 6756997, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 11826 (Tex. App.—Austin Dec. 21, 2017, no pet.). Σ.....47

State v. Morello, No. 16-0457, 2018 WL 1025685, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 169 (Tex. Feb. 23, 2018). ψ48

Shamrock Psychiatric Clinic, P.A. v. Tex. Dep't of Health & Human Servs., No. 16-0890, 2018 WL 1021437, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 170 (Tex. Feb. 23, 2018) (per curiam). Δ49

City of Killeen v. Worsdale, No. 03-17-00640-CV, 2018 WL 1077242, 2018 Tex. App. LEXIS 1545 (Tex. App.—Austin Feb. 28, 2018, no pet. h.). λ49

XI. Utilities.....50

CPS Energy v. Pub. Util. Comm'n of Tex., 03-14-00340-CV, 2017 WL 3902620, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 8290 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 31, 2017, pet. filed). φ50

W. Travis Cty. Pub. Util. Agency v. Travis Cty. Mun. Util. Dist., No. 12, No. 03-16-00880-CV, 2017 WL 3902625, Tex. App. LEXIS 8217 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 29, 2017, no pet.). Σ51

Pemberton, J., concurring. δ52

XII. Miscellaneous53

City of Krum v. Rice, No. 03-17-00478-CV, 2017 WL 6390973, 2017 Tex. LEXIS 1149, (Tex. Dec. 15, 2017). ζ53

City of San Antonio v. Tenorio, No. 16-0356, 2018 WL 1441791, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 245 (Tex. Mar. 23, 2018). £54

Boyd, J., dissenting. η54

Guzman, J., dissenting. Δ55

A. Plea to the Jurisdiction55

Harris Cnty. v. Annab, No. 17-0329, 2018 WL 2168484, 2018 LEXIS 402 (Tex. May 11, 2018). V55

Oncor Elec. Delivery Co. v. Elec. Delivery Co., LLC, 546 S.W.3d 133 (Tex. 2018). V56

Tex. Civil Commitment Office v. Hartshorn, No. 03-17-00181-CV, 2018 WL 2074576, 2018 Tex. App. LEXIS 3154 (Tex.—Austin 2018). Σ57

Hegar v. EBS Sols., Inc., NO. 03-17-00506-CV, 2018 WL 1885170, LEXIS 2816 (Tex.—2018). ¥58

Nazari v. Texas, No. 16-0549, 2018 WL 3077659, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 608 (Tex. 2018). δ59

City of Houston v. Houston Mun. Emples. Pension Sys., NO. 17-0242, 2018 WL 2749728, 2018 Tex. LEXIS 523 (Tex. Jun. 8, 2018). δ60

Taylor Housing Authority v. Shorts, NO. 03-16-00274-CV, NO. 03-16-00276-CV, 2018 Tex. App. LEXIS 2937, 2018 WL 1955550 (Tex.—Austin 2018). ★61

I. Introduction

This case law update includes many of the administrative law cases decided in Texas between August 2017 and April 2018. This is not an exhaustive review of all administrative law cases, nor do these synopses exhaustively cover all issues raised by these cases. We have attempted to choose cases representative of issues raised in Texas courts and to highlight the most salient points of each. Our views are not to be taken as the views of Texas Tech University School of Law and should not be interpreted as predictive of the result of future cases.

II. Agency Authority

Swate v. Tex. Med. Bd., No. 03-15-00815-CV, 2017 WL 3902621, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 8291 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 31, 2017, pet. filed). ⌘

Dr. Tommy Ernest Swate (Dr. Swate) began his career by practicing gynecology and obstetrics in 1975. Dr. Swate was practicing treating addiction and chronic pain in the Houston-area from 2007 to 2010. The Texas Medical Board (Board) brought a complaint

against Dr. Swate in 2011, alleging he violated the Texas Medical Practice Act under Texas Occupations sections 151.001-169.005 and Texas Administrative Code title 22, sections 160.1-190.16, due to his failure to keep adequate medical records while treating patients with addiction and chronic pain. The allegations specifically stated that Dr. Swate did not meet the standard of care regarding treatment because he did not keep records to support prescriptions that he authorized.

After hearings before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, the administrative law judges issued findings that Dr. Swate did violate the Act. Consequently, the Board revoked his license to practice medicine, but allowed him to petition the Board in one year for the re-issuance of his license. Dr. Swate then sought review of the Board’s decision from the district court. The district court reviewed the merits of the complaint and affirmed the Board’s final order. On appeal, Dr. Swate argued the district court erred for seven different reasons.

Dr. Swate’s first four challenges regarded the testimony of the Board’s expert witness. He argued the expert’s testimony had no evidence of reliability and could not be used

against him. After reviewing for an abuse of discretion on appeal, the court determined that the Board's expert witness was appropriate because his statements were not based on unreliable methods. In Dr. Swate's fifth issue, he challenged the validity of the Board's twelve exhibits that lack authentication of witnesses. He argued that it was "harmful error" and thus the exhibits should have been excluded. However, the court found that the judges did not abuse their discretion in admitting the exhibits because the Board met its burden of establishing good cause by stating Dr. Swate had copies of the exhibits ten months prior to the hearing. Dr. Swate's sixth issue involved whether enough evidence substantiated the Board's final order. The court presumes an order from an agency is valid under the substantial evidence standard. The party challenging the order must show that substantial evidence did not exist by pointing to unfair conclusions of fact or law. Dr. Swate failed to meet this high burden because no evidence on record proved that he performed initial exams on his patients that would support a rationale for providing prescriptions. The court found more evidence supporting the opposite proposition.

Finally, Dr. Swate's seventh and last issue accused the Board of issuing its final order in an arbitrary and capricious manner. The court looks to see whether fact-findings have support though evidence and whether there is a rational relationship between the findings of fact and the decision. Here, the court found that the Board adopted the judge's findings without any changes; therefore, the Board's final order was identical to the findings of fact. The judges found that Dr. Swate failed to treat ten patients under an acceptable standard of care, and therefore found that the Board acted with reasoned decision-making. The court of appeals affirmed the district court's order stating that the Board's order was proper in revoking Dr. Swate's medical license.

Graphic Packaging Corp. v. Hegar, 538 S.W.3d 89 (Tex. 2017). β

Graphic Packaging Corporation (Graphic) is a packaging seller in Texas and throughout the United States. Graphic is subject to the franchise tax in Texas, and in order to calculate this tax the company must decide what

portion of its business is attributable to Texas. Section 171.106 of the Texas Tax Code states that a taxpayer must calculate its tax base by multiplying the total business margin of the company by the fraction of gross receipts that come from its business in Texas. From 2008–09, Graphic used the calculation provided by section 171.106. Later, Graphic amended its 2008 and 2009 reports, and calculated its tax for 2010 with the chapter 141 apportionment formula of the Texas Tax Code—which is Texas's version of the Multistate Tax Compact (Compact). Graphic argued that the franchise tax was an income tax so the company could elect to use chapter 141's apportionment scheme.

The Comptroller disagreed, denying the tax refunds and assessing a deficiency, and stated that the exclusive way to determine the franchise tax was section 171.106's gross-receipts fraction. Graphic then pursued administrative relief unsuccessfully and paid the taxes the company had been assessed for 2010. The company then filed suit in the district court, arguing it was entitled to apportion its margin using chapter 141's formula and seeking \$821,961 for the tax years from 2008–10. Both parties filed motions for partial summary judgment on the issue of apportionment. The court granted the summary judgment motion for the Comptroller, denied Graphic's motion, and rendered a final judgment for the Comptroller. Graphic then appealed. The appellate court affirmed, holding that chapter 141's apportionment formula does not apply to the franchise tax because it is not an income tax as required by this section of the code. This appeal followed.

The Supreme Court of Texas did not decide the issue of whether Graphic's franchise tax for 2008–10 amounted to the income tax considered by chapter 141's apportionment formula. Instead, the court claimed that Graphic still had the burden of establishing that the legislature did not, or in the alternative could not, make section 171.106's single-factor formula the only valid means to apportion the Texas franchise tax. The court's analysis focused on the two issues, which the court of appeals chose not to consider: (1) whether the single-factor apportionment formula of section 171.106 precludes a company from using the Compact's three-factor formula included in chapter 141 of

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: Case Law Updates

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2018 Advanced Texas Administrative Law eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
13th Annual Advanced Texas Administrative Law Seminar session
"Case Law Update - Part I"