

The Court's Charge

The University of Texas School of Law
29th Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals
June 20, 2019

David Keltner

david.keltner@kellyhart.com

KELLY  HART

The *Payne* Rule

“There should be but one test for determining if a party has preserved error in the jury charge, and that is whether the party made the trial court aware of the complaint, timely and plainly, and obtained a ruling.”

Remember *Payne*

- Plaintiff sued after suffering a 12 foot fall into a State maintained culvert.
- The charge submitted *special* defect.
- The State objected the charge removed the question of whether it was a *special* or *premises* defect from the jury.
- State's request: Did the plaintiff have "*actual knowledge*" of the culvert?

3

Payne Holding

- The question was not whether the State's request should have been submitted.
- It is whether the State's question alerted the trial court that premises defect should be submitted.
- Why did the *request* make the court *aware* of the objection?
 - Because "actual knowledge" was *only* relevant to a premises defect claim.

4

Payne is Expanded

- *Tichacek*: Pretrial hearings on drainage issues make court aware of complaint. *Contrary to Rules 274 and 278.*
- *Wackenhut*: Spoliation hearing made court aware of complaint about spoliation instruction. *Contrary to Rule 274.*

Cruz v. Andrews Restoration, Inc.

- The issue was whether the omission of a question on trial attorneys' fees was preserved.
- No charge conference objection.
- Petitioner claimed that its pre-trial charge, which included the missing question, preserved the error.

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 Court's Charge

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
29th Annual Conference on State and Federal Appeals session
"Jury Charge Update"