

# 06-1018

---

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN, TEXAS

---

D.R. HORTON-TEXAS, LTD.

*Petitioner*

v.

MARKEL INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY, LTD.

*Respondent*

---

PETITIONER'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS

---

BLAKE S. EVANS  
State Bar No. 06706950  
  
STEPHEN W. BURNETT  
State Bar No. 24006931  
  
SCHUBERT & EVANS, P.C.  
900 Jackson Street, Suite 630  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
Telephone: 214-744-4400  
Facsimile: 214-744-4403

ROBERT B. GILBREATH  
State Bar No. 07904620  
  
HAWKINS, PARNELL  
& THACKSTON, LLP  
Highland Park Place  
4514 Cole Avenue, Suite 500  
Dallas, Texas 75205  
Telephone: 214-780-5100  
Facsimile: 214-780-5200

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER  
D.R. HORTON-TEXAS, LTD.

<p>Note: This paper was converted from a scanned image. The conversion has been reviewed for accuracy; however, minor spelling or text-conversion errors may still be present.</p>
--

## **IDENTITY OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL**

### Petitioner

D.R. Horton-Texas, Ltd.

### Counsel

Robert B. Gilbreath  
Hawkins, Parnell & Thackston, LLP.  
Highland Park Place  
4514 Cole Avenue, Suite 500  
Dallas, Texas 75205

Blake S. Evans  
Stephen W. Burnett  
Schubert & Evans, P.C.  
900 Jackson Street, Suite 630  
Dallas, Texas 75202

Maurice Bresenhan, Jr.  
Pascal Paul Piazza  
Zukowski Bresenham & Sinex, LLP.  
1177 West Loop South, Ste. 1100  
Houston, Texas 77027

### Respondent

Markel International Insurance  
Company, Ltd.

### Counsel

James M. Tompkins  
Les Pickett  
Todd F. Newman  
Galloway, Johnson, Tompkins, Burr & Smith  
3555 Timmons Lane, Suite 1225  
Houston, Texas 77027

### Additional Party to the Court of Appeals' Judgment

Sphere Drake Insurance, Ltd.

Robert A. Shults  
Jacob De Leon  
McFall, Sherwood & Breitbeil  
1331 Lamar, Suite 1250  
Four Houston Center  
Houston, Texas 77010

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

IDENTITY OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ii
INDEX OF AUTHORITIES .....	v
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	ix
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION .....	1
ISSUES PRESENTED .....	1
1. Did the court of appeals err in holding that D.R. Horton may not rely on extrinsic evidence consisting of coverage-only facts to establish that it was entitled to a defense as an additional insured on its subcontractor's liability insurance policy?	
2. Did the court of appeals err by conflating "duty to defend" with "duty to indemnify" and holding that because D.R. Horton could not introduce extrinsic evidence to establish a duty to defend, as a matter of law it also could not establish a duty to indemnify?	
WHY THIS CASE IS IMPORTANT.....	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	3
I. James and Cicely Holmes sue D.R. Horton claiming defects in the construction and repair of their house.....	3
II. D.R. Horton asks Markel and Sphere Drake to defend it against the Holmeses' claims, and they fail to do so.....	3
III. D.R. Horton sues Markel and Sphere Drake to recover its defense costs and indemnity for its settlement with the Holmeses, and the trial court renders summary judgment for the insurers .....	4
IV. The court of appeals affirms the trial court's summary judgment for Markel.....	5
V. The court of appeals issues a second opinion on rehearing and again affirms the trial court's summary judgment for Markel .....	6

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	8
ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES.....	10
I. Introduction.....	10
II. The Court Of Appeals Erred In Holding That All Of D.R. Horton's Extrinsic Evidence Related To Both Coverage And Liability.....	12
A. D.R. Horton's extrinsic evidence consisted of coverage-only facts establishing that it is entitled to a defense as an additional insured.....	12
B. D.R. Horton's extrinsic evidence did not have any bearing on liability or damages.....	16
III. The Court Should Formally Recognize An Exception To The Eight- Corners Rule For Extrinsic Evidence Consisting Of Coverage-Only Facts.....	18
A. <i>GuideOne</i> left open the possibility of a limited exception to the eight- corners rule.....	18
B. Courts are uncertain about the effect of <i>GuideOne</i> .....	19
C. This case presents the Court with an opportunity to formally recognize a limited exception to the eight-corners rule.....	21
1. A limited "coverage-only" facts exception protects the contractual expectations of both insured and insurers.....	22
2. An inflexible eight-corners rule without such an exception leads to inequitable results.....	22
3. Strict application of the eight-corners rule led to an unfair result in this case.....	24
IV. The Court Of Appeals Erred In Holding That Because D.R. Horton Could Not Introduce Extrinsic Evidence To Establish A Duty To Defend, As A Matter Of Law It Also Could Not Establish A Duty To Indemnify.....	25
A. Historically, an insurer's duty to indemnify was not justiciable until the underlying trial concluded.....	26

B.	<i>Griffin</i> is a limited exception to the <i>Burch</i> rule.....	27
C.	The <i>Griffin</i> exception does not apply here.....	28
D.	The court of appeals erroneously applied <i>Griffin</i> in blanket fashion .....	29
E.	The Court should take this opportunity to reiterate the limited nature of its holding in <i>Griffin</i> .....	31
1.	Courts have extended the <i>Griffin</i> exception beyond its intended reach.....	31
2.	Some courts accidentally reach the correct result under <i>Griffin</i> .....	32
3.	Other courts reach an incorrect result because they do not grasp the holding in <i>Griffin</i> .....	33
4.	The court of appeals in this case did not understand the holding in <i>Griffin</i> and reached the wrong result.....	34
CONCLUSION.....		35
PRAYER.....		36
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....		37
APPENDIX.....		38

## INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Alvarado v. Bolton</i> , 749 S.W.2d 47 (Tex. 1988).....	17
<i>American States Ins. Co. v. Bailey</i> , 133 F.3d 363 (5th Cir. 1998).....	33
<i>B. Hall Contracting, Inc. v. Evanston Ins. Co.</i> , 447 F.Supp.2d 634 (N.D. Tex. 2006).....	19
<i>Bayou Bend Homes, Inc. v. Scottsdale Ins. Co.</i> , 2006 WL 2037564 (S.D. Tex. July 18, 2006).....	19, 20, 21
<i>Centex Homes v. Buecher</i> , 95 S.W.3d 266 (Tex. 2002).....	16
<i>Cook v. Ohio Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , 418 S.W.2d 712 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1967, no writ).....	15
<i>D.R. Horton-Texas, Ltd. v. Markel Int'l Ins. Co., Ltd. &amp; Sphere Drake Ins., Ltd.</i> , 2006 WL 3040756 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2006, pet. pending).....	Passim
<i>D.R. Horton-Texas, Ltd. v. Markel Int'l Ins. Co., Ltd. &amp; Sphere Drake Ins., Ltd.</i> , No. 14-05-00486-CV (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] June 29, 2006).....	6
<i>D.R. Horton-Texas, Ltd. v. Markel Int'l Ins. Co., Ltd.</i> , 2006 WL 176571 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] January 26, 2006).....	5, 6
<i>Fair Operating Inc. v. Mid-Continent Cas. Co.</i> , 193 Fed. Appx. 302 (5th Cir. 2006).....	21
<i>Farmers Tex. County Mut. Ins. Co. v. Griffin</i> , 955 S.W.2d 81 (Tex. 1997).....	Passim
<i>Firemen's Ins. Co. of Newark, N.J. v. Burch</i> , 442 S.W.2d 331 (Tex. 1968).....	26, 27, 28, 29, 31
<i>Foust v. Ranger Ins. Co.</i> , 975 S.W.2d 329 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1998, pet denied).....	31
<i>GlobalSun Pools, Inc. v. Burlington Ins. Co.</i> , 2004 WL 878283 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2004, no pet.).....	24, 25

<i>GuideOne Elite Ins. Co. v. Fielder Road Baptist Church</i> , 197 S.W.3d 305 (Tex. 2006).....	Passim
<i>Humber v. Morton</i> , 426 S.W.2d 554 (Tex. 1968).....	16
<i>Int'l Serv. Ins. Co. v. Boll</i> , 392 S.W.2d 160 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston 1965, writ ref'd n.r.e.).....	13, 14, 19
<i>J.M. Kupar Constr. Co. v. Rosenberg</i> , 95 S.W.3d 322 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist] 2002, no pet.).....	16
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Graham</i> , 473 F.3d 596 (5th Cir. 2006).....	21
<i>Markel Int'l Ins. Co. v. Campise Homes, Inc.</i> , 2006 WL 1662604 (S.D. Tex. 2006).....	29, 30
<i>Nat'l Fire Ins. Co. v. Entm't Ins. Serv., Inc.</i> , 485 F.Supp.2d 737 (N.D. Tex. 2007).....	21
<i>Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa. v. Merchants Fast Motor Lines, Inc.</i> , 939 S.w.2d 139 (Tex. 1997).....	23
<i>Northfield Ins. Co. v. Loving Home Care, Inc.</i> , 363 F.3d 523 (5th Cir. 2004).....	2, 19, 21
<i>Pine Oak Builders, Inc. v. Great Am. Lloyds Ins. Co.</i> , — S.W.3d —, 2006 WL 1892669 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2006, pet. pending).....	6, 7, 20, 21
<i>Raymond v. Rahme</i> , 78 S.W.3d 552 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.).....	17
<i>Reser v. State Farm &amp; Cas. Co.</i> , 981 S.W.2d 260 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1998, no pet.).....	31
<i>Trinity Universal Ins. Co. v. Cowan</i> , 945 S.W.2d 819 (Tex. 1997).....	26, 29, 35
<i>Sentry Ins. v. DFW Alliance Corp.</i> , 2007 WL 669418 (N.D. Tex. 2007).....	20
<i>State Farm Lloyds v. Jones</i> , 2007 WL 654350 (E.D. Tex. 2007).....	20

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: Insuring the Construction Project: Drafting Strategies, Risk Management Considerations, and Insurance Options

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
2007 Construction Law Conference session

"Insuring the Construction Project: Drafting Strategies, Risk Management Considerations,  
and Insurance Options"