
SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS UPDATE

Jeffrey S. Boyd
Justice
Supreme Court of Texas

Kelly Canavan
Staff Attorney

Robert Brailas
Staff Attorney

Angela Estrada
Law Clerk

Zackery Horton
Law Clerk

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

Table of Contents

I. SCOPE OF THIS PAPER	0
II. DECIDED CASES	0
A. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW	0
1. Judicial Review	0
2. Public Utility Commission	1
3. School District Grievances	2
B. ARBITRATION	3
1. Enforcement of Arbitration Agreement	3
2. Pre-arbitration Discovery	7
C. ATTORNEYS	8
1. Attorney Immunity / Judicial-Proceedings Privilege	8
2. Liability to non-clients	9
D. CIVIL COMMITMENT	11
1. Factual Sufficiency	11
2. Jury Instructions and Questions	12
E. CONTRACTS	13
1. Assumption of Liabilities	13
F. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW	13
1. Due Course of Law.....	13
G. ELECTIONS	14
1. Ballots	14
2. Drive-Thru Voting	17
3. Early Voting.....	18
4. Voting by Mail.....	19
H. EMPLOYMENT LAW	19
1. Age Discrimination	19
2. Whistleblower Actions.....	20
I. EXPUNCTION OF ARREST RECORDS	22
1. Statutory Requirements	22
J. FAMILY LAW	23
1. Ambiguous Orders	23

2.	Emergency Removal	24
3.	Parental Presumption	26
4.	Termination of Parental Rights	26
K.	FARM ANIMAL ACTIVITIES ACT	28
1.	Interpretation and Application	28
L.	FEDERAL PREEMPTION	29
1.	Airline Deregulation Act	29
M.	GOVERNMENTAL IMMUNITY	30
1.	Contract Claims	30
2.	Independent Contractors.....	31
3.	Takings.....	32
N.	INSURANCE	33
1.	Appraisal Clauses.....	33
2.	Insurance Code Liability	35
3.	Policies/Coverage	36
4.	<i>Stowers</i> Claims	40
O.	INTENTIONAL TORTS	41
1.	Defamation.....	41
P.	JURISDICTION	42
1.	Mandamus Jurisdiction.....	42
2.	Mootness	43
3.	Standing.....	45
4.	Subject Matter Jurisdiction	45
Q.	MANDAMUS	47
1.	Diligent Protection of Rights.....	47
R.	MEDICAL LIABILITY.....	48
1.	Expert Reports	48
S.	NEGLIGENCE.....	49
1.	Common Carriers	49
2.	Independent Contractors.....	50
3.	Premises Liability.....	51
4.	Supervisory Liability	53
T.	OIL AND GAS	54

1.	Continuous drilling clause	54
2.	Leases.....	55
3.	Royalty Payments.....	56
U.	PARTNERSHIPS	57
1.	Breach of Partnership Agreement	57
2.	Claims of an Individual Partner	59
V.	PROCEDURE—APPELLATE.....	60
1.	Remand in the Interest of Justice.....	60
2.	Jurisdiction	61
3.	Supersedeas Bonds	61
4.	Temporary Orders	62
5.	Waiver	63
W.	PROCEDURE—PRETRIAL.....	64
1.	Discovery	64
2.	Forum-Selection Clauses.....	66
3.	Medical Expense Affidavits.....	67
4.	Responsible Third-Party Designation.....	68
5.	Service of Process.....	69
6.	Summary Judgment	70
X.	PROCEDURE—TRIAL AND POST-TRIAL	71
1.	New Trial	71
2.	Restraining Orders	72
Y.	PRODUCTS LIABILITY	73
1.	Design Defects	73
Z.	REAL PROPERTY	74
1.	Boundary Stipulations	74
2.	Deed Correction	76
3.	Implied Covenants.....	76
4.	Trespass to Try Title	78
5.	Subrogation.....	79
AA.	RES JUDICATA	79
1.	Elements of Res Judicata	79
BB.	STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.....	80

1. Accrual	80
CC. TEXAS CITIZENS PARTICIPATION ACT	81
1. Deadlines.....	81
DD. TEXAS TIM COLE ACT	84
1. Eligibility for Compensation	84
EE. TEXAS UNIFORM TRADE SECRETS ACT	84
1. Sealing Exhibits.....	84
FF. WORKERS' COMPENSATION	85
1. Administrative Review	85
2. Borrowed Servant	86
3. Independent Contractors.....	87
4. Intentional-Injury Exception	89
III. GRANTED CASES.....	91
A. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW.....	91
1. Jurisdiction	91
B. ATTORNEYS.....	93
1. Fees	93
C. CONTRACTS	94
1. Implied Revocation	94
D. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.....	94
1. Religion Clauses	94
E. EMPLOYMENT LAW	95
1. Disability Discrimination.....	95
1. Retaliation.....	96
F. FAMILY LAW.....	97
1. Parental Visitation	97
2. Termination of Parental Rights	98
G. GOVERNMENTAL IMMUNITY	99
1. Takings.....	99
H. INSURANCE	100
1. Duty to Defend.....	100
2. Policies/Coverage	101
I. INTENTIONAL TORTS.....	102

1.	Defamation.....	102
J.	MANDAMUS	103
1.	Adequacy of Appellate Remedy.....	103
K.	MUNICIPAL LAW.....	104
1.	Zoning.....	104
L.	OIL AND GAS	105
1.	Pooling.....	105
M.	PROBATE: WILLS, TRUSTS, ESTATES, AND GUARDIANSHIPS .	106
1.	Will Contests.....	106
N.	PROCEDURE—PRETRIAL.....	107
1.	Discovery.....	107
O.	PRODUCTS LIABILITY	109
1.	Online retailers.....	109
P.	STATUTORY IMMUNITY	110
1.	Communications Decency Act.....	110
Q.	STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.....	110
1.	Accrual	110
R.	TAXES.....	111
1.	Charter School Exemption	111

I. SCOPE OF THIS PAPER

This paper surveys cases that were decided by the Supreme Court of Texas from June 1, 2020 through May 31, 2021. Petitions granted but not yet decided are also included.

The summaries do not constitute the Court's official descriptions or statements. Readers are encouraged to review the Court's official opinions for specifics regarding each case. The Court appreciates suggestions and corrections, which may be sent via email to kelly.canavan@txcourts.gov.

II. DECIDED CASES

A. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

1. Judicial Review

a) Tex. Bd. of Chiropractic Exam'rs v. Tex. Med. Ass'n, 616 S.W.3d 558 (Tex. Jan. 29, 2021) [18-1223]

At issue in this case was whether rules issued by the Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners defining the terms "musculoskeletal system" and "subluxation complex" and authorizing chiropractors to perform a type of eye-movement test known by the acronym "VONT" exceed the scope of practice in the Texas Chiropractic Act. The Texas Medical Association (TMA) sued the Board under the Administrative Procedure Act for a declaration that the challenged rules are invalid. TMA argued that references to nerves in the definitions have the effect of authorizing chiropractors to perform medical neurology and that VONT should only be performed by a physician. After a bench trial, the trial court concluded that the challenged rules exceed the

scope of chiropractic and rendered judgment for TMA. The court of appeals affirmed that part of the trial court's judgment.

The Supreme Court reversed the part of the court of appeals' judgment declaring the rules invalid and rendered judgment that they are valid. The Court first addressed the threshold issue of whether TMA had demonstrated its right to proceed under section 2001.038(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, which authorizes a challenge to the validity of a legal rule when "it is alleged that the rule . . . threatens to interfere with or impair[] a legal right or privilege of the plaintiff." The Court held that TMA's allegation that the challenged rules diminish the value of a physician's medical license satisfied the statutory test and distinguished the statutory prerequisite in section 2001.038(a) for bringing suit from the constitutional requirement of standing.

The Court then turned to the court's role in a section 2001.038(a) suit for judicial review of an agency rule. The lower courts' judgments relied on testimony by TMA witnesses regarding the appropriate line between medicine and chiropractic, and neither court had given any deference to the Board's rules. The Court reaffirmed that administrative agency rules are presumed valid and that the court's analysis in a section 2001.038(a) suit for judicial review is limited to the legal question whether the challenged rule contravenes the governing statute's text or purpose. Applying that standard to the rules challenged by TMA, the Court held that all three were valid.

Justice Bland issued a dissenting opinion that was joined by Justice Boyd. The dissenting justices would have held that the Board rule authorizing VONT exceeds the statutory scope of chiropractic because the Chiropractic Act authorizes chiropractors to diagnose and treat problems of the spine and musculoskeletal system, while VONT is intended to diagnose neurological problems in the inner ear.

2. Public Utility Commission

a) *Pub. Util. Comm'n of Tex. v. Tex. Indus. Energy Consumers*, — S.W.3d —, 2021 WL — (Tex. Mar. 26, 2021) [18-1061]

This case presented three issues: first, whether the court of appeals applied the correct standard in reviewing the Public Utility Commission's conclusion that construction of a power plant was "prudent"; second, whether substantial evidence supported the Commission's conclusion; and third, whether the Commission erred in permitting the utility to include financing costs that exceeded the project's initial cap on capital costs in its rate base.

In 2008, the Commission allowed Southwestern Electric Power Company (SWEPCO) to begin construction of a coal-fired power plant, but it capped the costs that could be passed on to Texas consumers. In 2012, before the plant went into service, SWEPCO filed an application with the Commission to increase its rate base to include the plant's construction costs. Several parties objected to inclusion of the full construction costs in the rate base. They argued that SWEPCO did not prudently monitor economic and regulatory conditions and that

SWEPCO should have abandoned construction by June 2010.

In its final order, the Commission concluded that although SWEPCO had no contemporaneous evidence to support its decision-making process, continued construction was prudent based on SWEPCO's after-the-fact justifications. The Commission further determined that the disputed financing costs (i.e., allowance for funds used during construction) were not included in the cap on capital costs. The trial court affirmed.

The court of appeals reversed, opining that the Commission had set a standard that required SWEPCO to present "independent, retrospective analyses" of the project. Because SWEPCO did not produce independent expert testimony, the court held, the Commission's decision was arbitrary and capricious. The court of appeals did not address whether the financing costs were included in the cap.

The Supreme Court reversed on the first issue. It held that the Commission did not act arbitrarily in objectively evaluating whether a reasonably prudent utility manager could have decided, as SWEPCO did, to complete construction of the plant. The Court explained that the Commission had applied the prudence standard it squarely articulated: "The standard for determining prudence is the exercise of that judgment or the choosing of one of a select range of options which a reasonable utility manager would exercise or choose in the same or similar circumstances given the information or alternatives available at the point in time such judgment is exercised or option chosen." The standard did not require

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 \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](https://utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Supreme Court of Texas Update

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2021 eConference on State and Federal Appeals](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
31st Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals session
"Texas Supreme Court Update"