PUBLICATION UPDATE

Route to:		

Dorsaneo, Texas Litigation Guide

Publication 719 Release 139 November 2020

HIGHLIGHTS

Revised Damages and Fees Chapters

 Chs. 20 and 22 have been updated and renumbered to Chs. 294 and 295. Chs. 21 and 21A have been updated and renumbered to Chs. 217 and 218.

Gender Indentity Discrimination

 The U.S. Supreme Court held that Title VII covers employment discrimination claims based on an employee's sexual orientation or gender identity, resolving a circuit split on the issue. See Ch. 203A.

This release updates Texas Litigation Guide with recent Texas Supreme Court and court of appeals decisions and federal cases. Many of the significant developments in this release are summarized below.

Revised and Renumbered Chapters. Four chapter have been extensively revised and renumbered in this release:

- Chapter 20, *Damages in Tort*, is now Chapter. 294 in Volume 19.
- Chapter 21, Contract Damages, is now Chapter 217 in Volume 14.
- Chapter 21A, Actions in Quasi Contract, is now Chapter 218 in Volume 14.
- Chapter 22, Attorney's Fees, is now Chapter 295 in Volume 19.

Pretrial, Trial, and Appellate Practice

Jurisdiction of Texas Courts. Legislation effective September 1, 2020 [see Acts 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., ch. 696 (SB 2342)] raises the general

maximum amount in controversy in statutory county court from \$200,000 to \$250,000, and in justice court from \$10,000 to \$20,000; these changes have been made in Ch. 2, *Jurisdiction of Texas Courts*.

Professional Responsibility. In *Bethel v. Quilling*, 595 S.W.3d 651, 657 (Tex. 2020), the Texas Supreme Court discussed an attorney's duties to nonclients and reaffirmed the rule that attorney civil immunity protects an attorney from liability when the conduct is connected with representing a client in litigation, even when the conduct is wrongful. See Ch. 3, *Professional Responsibility*.

Pleadings. The Texas Supreme Court has approved revised technology standards set by the Judicial Committee on Information Technology, which govern the form of electronically filed documents. See Ch. 30, *Commencement of Actions*, § 30.02[3][k], [1].

Arbitrator, Not Court, Decides Whether Arbitration Forum Available. This release includes Bonsmara Nat. Beef Co., LLC v. Hart of Tex. Cattle Feeders, LLC, ____ S.W.3d ___, 2020 Tex. LEXIS 617, *26 (Tex. 2020), in which the Texas Supreme Court held that the availability of an arbitral forum is a matter of procedural arbitrability, which courts must allow arbitrators to decide. See Ch. 44, Arbitration, § 44.02[2].

Court, Not Arbitrator, Decides Government Immunity Issue. This release is updated with The Texas Supreme Court case San Antonio River Auth. v. Austin Bridge & Rd., *L.P.*, 601 S.W.3d 616, 2020 Tex. LEXIS 375, *18 (Tex. 2020), in which the Court held that a court, rather than an arbitrator, must decide whether governmental immunity is waived with respect to the proceeding at issue. See Ch. 44, *Arbitration*, § 44.02[2].

Declaratory Judgment— Ripeness Required. In *Southwestern Elec. Power Co. v. Lynch*, 595 S.W.3d 678, 685 (Tex. 2020), the Texas Supreme Court reiterated that when determining whether a suit for a declaratory judgment presents a court with a ripe controversy, the declaration sought must actually resolve the controversy. See Ch. 45, *Declaratory Relief*, § 45.02[1].

Reformation. In *Yowell v. Granite Operating Co.*, ____ S.W.3d ___, 2020 Tex. LEXIS 425, at *7 (May 15, 2020), the Texas Supreme Court interpreted Property Code § 5.043, which requires a court to reform or construe interests in real or personal property that violate the rule against perpetuities. See Ch. 53, *Reformation*, § 53.01[3].

Dismissal of Baseless Claims. In Bethel v. Quilling, 595 S.W.3d 651, 656 (Tex. 2020), the Texas Supreme Court discussed Rule 91a, holding that a motion to dismiss baseless claims may be based on an affirmative defense if the plaintiff's allegations, taken as true, together with inferences reasonably drawn from them, do not entitle the claimant to the relief sought. See Ch. 103, Dismissal, § 103.02[1].

Dismissal Based on Certificate of

Merit Requirement. In Lalonde v. Gosnell, 593 S.W.3d 212, 216 (Tex. 2019), The Texas Supreme Court addressed the certificate of merit requirement in suits against architects or engineers, holding that a defendant can waive the requirement by litigation conduct that is inconsistent with claiming the right to dismissal. See Ch. 103, Dismissal, § 103.04[2][e].

Jury Charge. Civil Rule 277 has been amended to require separate questions in cases seeking termination of the parent-child relationship, moving away from broad-form questions in this area. See Ch. 122, *Jury Charge*, § 122.04[7].

Business and Commercial Law

Forming a Contract. The Texas Supreme Court held as a matter of law that email exchanges failed to establish a meeting of the minds when the parties agreed prior to a bidding process that an executed and delivered definitive agreement was a condition precedent to contract formation, as the parties never executed a definitive agreement. The Court strictly held the parties to the condition precedent to contract formation to which they agreed because, in the context of sophisticated transactions conducted via email, and given the distinctly informal nature of emails, the condition protects parties who wish freely to engage in email negotiations without inadvertently binding themselves. See [Chalker Energy Partners III, LLC v. Le Norman Operating LLC, 595 S.W.3d 668 (Tex. 2020)]. See also Ch. 210A, Contracts, § 210A.04[1][a].

Measure of Damages. The Texas Supreme Court held a plaintiff was not entitled to a permanent injunction in a trade secret misappropriation action when the plaintiff sought and put on evidence of past damages and measured its value by projected future income streams to show the value an investor would have paid for the trade secrets. By measuring past damages in this manner, the Court reasoned the plaintiff proved the remedy it sought was unavailable because future damages could be measured, thereby providing an adequate legal remedy. See [Pike v. Texas EMC Mgmt., LLC, 63 Tex. Sup. J. 1384, ____ S.W.3d ____, 2020 Tex. LEXIS 568 (Tex. 2020)]. See also 200B, TradeCh. Secrets. § 200B.23[2][d].

Gender Identity Discrimination. The United States Supreme Court held that Title VII covers employment discrimination claims based on an employee's sexual orientation or gender identity, resolving a circuit split on the issue. See [Bostock v. Clayton Cty., ___ U.S. ___, 140 S. Ct. 1731, 207 L. Ed. 2d 218, 2020 U.S. LEXIS 3252 (2020)]. See also Ch. 203A, Employment Litigation, § 203A.11[1][a].

Family Law

Proceedings Before Associate Judge. The Texas Supreme Court has held that if the parties elect a bench trial before the associate judge, Family Code Chapter 201 does not confer a right to demand a jury trial in a de novo hearing [In Interest of A.L.M.-F., 593 S.W.3d 271, 283

(Tex. 2019)]. See Ch. 360A, *Temporary Orders*, § 360A.10[4][b], [8].

Mediated Settlement Agreement.

The Texas Supreme Court has held that the parties to a mediated settlement agreement may sign the agreement before or after a divorce petition is filed. The lack of a pending suit at the time the parties sign their

from meeting the requirements of Family Code Section 6.602 [Highsmith v. Highsmith, 587 S.W.3d 771, 775–777 (Tex. 2019)]. See Ch. 362, *Divorce*, § 362.41[4].

MSA does not preclude the MSA

Attorney's Fees. The lodestar method of determining the reasonableness and necessity of attorney's fees in dissolution suits and SAPCRs is discussed in Ch. 370, SAPCR Procedures, § 370.11[2].

Parental Presumption. The Texas Supreme Court has held that the common-law presumption that fit parents act according to the best interest of their children applies when modifying an existing order that names a parent as the child's managing conservator [In re C.J.C., 603 S.W.3d 804, 2020 Tex. LEXIS 610, *19–*25 (June 26, 2020)]. See Ch. 373, Modification of SAPCR Orders, § 373.04[2].

Insurance Litigation

Workers' Compensation; Exclusive Remedy. The intentional tort exception to the exclusive remedy provision applies only when the employer had the specific intent to inflict the precise injury that occurred to the claimant, or the belief that the very same injury to the same claimant was

substantially certain to result [Mo-Vac Serv. Co., Inc. v. Escobedo, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1312 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 340, Workers' Compensation, § 340.40[2].

Liability Insurance; Duty to Defend; Eight-Corners Rule. The parties to an insurance policy can agree that the eight-corners rule does not apply in determining the duty to defend, but the mere failure to include a clause promising to defend claims that are "groundless, false, or fraudulent" is not sufficient to do so [Richards v. State Farm Lloyds, 597 S.W.3d 492 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 341, Liability Insurance, § 341.04[3].

An exception to the eight-corners rule permits extrinsic evidence if it conclusively proves that the insured and the third party colluded to make false representations of fact for the purpose of securing a defense and coverage where they would not otherwise exist. This claim of collusion may be raised by a separate action for a declaratory judgment, or as a defense to a subsequent action alleging breach of the duty to defend [Loya Ins. Co. v. Avalos, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 969 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 341, *Liability Insurance*, § 341.04[3].

Personal Injury Litigation

Negligence; Common Carrier. It was not necessary to consider whether to alter or overrule the heightened duty of care imposed on common carriers because the evidence in the case supported the jury's verdict under an ordinary negligence standard [Via Metro. Transit v. Meck, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1495 (Tex.

2020)]. See Ch. 290, Negligence, § 290.02[3][b]; Ch. 301, Passenger's Claims, §§ 301.01[1], 301.03[1].

Negligence; Cases Involving Animals. When the duty imposed by the Transportation Code to keep livestock off a highway right-of-way applies: (1) it is the exclusive basis for the owner's liability, regardless of any local stock law; and (2) it requires a demonstration of actual knowledge, not merely that the owner should have known that the animal was at large [Pruski v. Garcia, 594 S.W.3d 322 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 290, Negligence, § 290.30[1][a]; 300, Operator's Liability, §§ 300.02[4], 300.141[1].

A ranch hand is not a "participant" in a covered activity under the Farm Animal Act, so it does not limit the liability of a rancher for an injury to a ranch hand; instead, liability is governed by common law, or by workers' compensation if the rancher was a subscriber [Waak v. Rodriguez, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1342 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 290, Negligence, § 290.20[4][f]; Ch. 340, Workers' Compensation, § 340.03[11].

Negligence; Shooting Ranges. If an employee of a sport shooting range is a named defendant whose conduct is implicated by the allegations, the employee is entitled to dismissal for failure of the claimant to serve an expert report required by Civil Practices and Remedies Code Chapter 128. A docket control order does not extend the time to serve the report unless it explicitly mentions the statutory deadline [Shinogle v.

Whitlock, 596 S.W.3d 772 (Tex. 2020) (per curiam)]. See Ch. 290, *Negligence*, § 290.20[4][f]; See Ch. 311, *Nuisance*, § 311.04[2][b].

Premises Liability; Animals. In a case arising out of a brown-recluse spider bite that occurred indoors, the landowner owed no duty to an invitee because: (1) he was unaware of the presence of the spider on his property, and he neither attracted it to the property nor reduced it to his possession, and (2) the invitee had actual knowledge of the presence of spiders on the property [Hillis v. McCall, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 577 (Tex. 2020)]. See 310, Premises Liability, § 310.03[5].

Defamation; Pre-Filing Requirements. Under the Defamation Mitigation Act: (1) the burden is on the defendant to raise the Act, so it does not affect the plaintiff's pleadings; (2) either a request for a change or an actual change without a request is sufficient to comply with the Act; and (3) a request by any form of communication is sufficient if it clearly states the desire that the identified false allegations be removed or revised [Warner Bros. Entm't v. Jones, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 990 (Tex. 2020)]. See 333, Libeland Slander, § 333.21[5].

Defamation; Required Injury. When a corporate claimant asserts claims for business disparagement and defamation in the alternative, but requests submission of only the latter, the jury findings will not support a verdict when the only evidence submitted was of commercial harm

[Innovative Block of S. Tex., Ltd. v. Valley Builders Supply, Inc., 2020 Tex. LEXIS 612 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 333, *Libel and Slander*, §§ 333.03[2][c], 333.10[2].

Defamation; TCPA; Reconsideration. When the court either grants or denies a TCPA motion within the 30-day window allowed by the statute, it may vacate that order after the window has closed, provided it acts before an appeal is filed or the court's plenary power expires [In re Panchakarla, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1051 (Tex. 2020) (per curiam)]. See Ch. 333, *Libel and Slander*, § 333.42[5][b].

Wrongful Imprisonment; Tim Cole Act. When the claimant is exonerated because his or her actions were not criminal at the time they were committed, that is a demonstration of actual innocence that supports compensation under the Act [In re Lester, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1100 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 331, False Imprisonment, § 331.08[3].

Medical Malpractice; Health Care Liability Claim. Under Civil Practices and Remedies Code Chapter 74: (1) a corporation can be a "claimant" to the extent it asserts an HCLC, and even if it seeks only economic damages; and (2) a hospital's alleged negligence in controlling the spread of a virus stated an HCLC because it implicated safety standards directly related to health care, i.e., the care and treatment of the original virus-infected patient [Coming Attractions Bridal & Formal, Inc. v. Tex. Health Res., 595 S.W.3d 659 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 321, Medical Malpractice, § 321.02[2][f], [8].

Medical Malpractice; Periodic Payments. Periodic payments of the recovery on an HCLC are mandatory when the defendant requests them, but the amount to be paid by that method is within the trial court's discretion; the burden is on the requesting party to show the amount that should be paid by that method [Regent Care of San Antonio, L.P. v. Detrick, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1044 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 321, Medical Malpractice, § 321.19[2][a].

Governmental Immunity; Negligence Defined. Under the Tort Claims Act, negligence is defined by common law, so whatever degree of negligence of an employee would be required to impose liability on a private employer also applies to the liability of a government unit, including the "slight" negligence standard for common carriers [Via Metro. Transit v. Meck, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1495 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 293, Claims Against Governmental Entities, § 293.10[3][b].

Governmental Immunity; Riot Exception to Waiver. Under the Tort Claims Act, *riot* means a disturbance of the peace by an assemblage of seven or more persons acting with a common purpose in a tumultuous manner that immediately threatens or terrorizes the public or an institution. If the jurisdictional allegations and evidence do not create a material question of fact as to the existence of a riot, the exception applies as a matter of law [Tex. Dep't of Criminal Justice v. Rangel, 595 S.W.3d 198,

208–211 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 293, Claims Against Governmental Entities, § 293.12[10].

Governmental Immunity; Notice to Government Unit. The unit is "subjectively aware" for purposes of actual notice when it has both knowledge of the elemental facts, and notice that it might be liable based on those facts, and a confession of fault or actual liability are not required. The unit's own investigation of the claim therefore shows actual notice [Reyes v. Jefferson Cty., 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 786 (Tex. 2020) (per curiam)]. See Ch. 293, Claims Against Governmental Entities, § 293.16[1][c].

Governmental Immunity; Schools. Open-enrollment charter schools are an arm of the state and therefore possess common law governmental immunity, regardless of the provisions of the Education Code [El Paso Educ. Initiative, Inc. v. Amex Props., LLC, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1166 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 293, Claims Against Governmental Entities, §§ 293.10[3][a], 293.13[2][f].

Government Immunity: Universities. Although a private university's police department engages in the governmental function of law enforcement, the university itself does not have immunity for actions of the department's officers [Univ. of the Incarnate Word v. Redus, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1136 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 293, Claims Against Governmental Entities, § 293.10[3][b].

Governmental Immunity; Use of Property. When a governmental unit

authorizes or orders an employee to use tangible personal property for a specific purpose, the unit has engaged in a "use" of that property for purposes of the Tort Claims Act [Tex. Dep't of Criminal Justice v. Rangel, 595 S.W.3d 198, 206–208 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 293, Claims Against Governmental Entities, § 293.10[5][c].

Governmental Immunity; Derived Immunity for Contractor. A contractor cannot claim derivative immunity as to claims for its own alleged fraud in performing a government contract when it retains some discretion with regard to the conduct at issue, but it has immunity as to claims of conspiracy and aiding and abetting the government unit's fraud [Nettles v. GTECH Corp., 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1293 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 293, Claims Against Governmental Entities, § 293.10[3][b].

Governmental Immunity; Declaratory Judgment. When a city is a party to action under the Expedited Declaratory Judgment Act [see Tex. Gov't Code § 1205.001 et seq.], the city does not have governmental immunity because the action is brought in rem to adjudicate interests in property [City of Conroe v. San Jacinto River Auth., 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 671 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 293, Claims Against Governmental Entities, § 293.01[2].

Legal Malpractice; Limitations. Under the *Peeler* rule barring a convicted criminal from pursuing a legal malpractice claim until the conviction has been set aside: (1) pleading

and proof of innocence are required to show "exoneration," unless the conviction was set aside based on actual innocence; and (2) limitations is tolled on the claim during both direct appeals and post-conviction proceedings, but runs when neither is pending [Gray v. Skelton, 595 S.W.3d 633 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 322, *Professional Malpractice*, § 322.02[1][e], [f].

Legal Malpractice; Immunity. Attorney immunity for acts done in the course of representing a client applies even if the claimant alleges that the acts constituted a crime [Bethel v. Quilling, 595 S.W.3d 651 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 322, *Professional Malpractice*, § 322.02[1][f].

Responsible Third Parties. A defendant's disclosure of a potential responsible third party is timely when it was made within the time permitted by the disclosure and discovery rules, so the mere fact that the defendant could have disclosed prior to that time and before the expiration of the limitations period is inconsequential [In re Mobile Mini, Inc., 596 S.W.3d 781 (Tex. 2020) (per curiam)]. See Ch. 291, Proportionate Responsibility; Contribution and Indemnity, § 291.03[2][b].

Real Estate Litigation

Restrictive Covenants; Access to Property. A restriction that conveyed property for a residential subdivision that could be accessed only by a single point of entry was: (1) not void as against public policy; and (2) not waived by the mere failure to repeat, mention, or otherwise include the restriction in a subsequent replat of the tract [Teal Trading & Dev., LP v. Champee Springs Ranches Prop. Owners Ass'n, 593 S.W.3d 324 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 285, *Restrictions*, §§ 285.02[9][b], 285.04[2][b].

Construction Contracts; Local Governments. Under Local Government Code Chapter 271: (1) the statute itself authorizes local government units to agree to arbitrate claims, and no separate statutory authorization is required; and (2) whether the unit's immunity is waived is jurisdictional and therefore reserved for judicial resolution, even if the contract purports to assign the issue to the arbitrator [San Antonio River Auth. v. Austin Bridge & Rd., L.P., 2020 Tex. LEXIS 375 (Tex. 2020)]]. See Ch 270. Construction Contracts. § 270.01[5][b].

That a contract is "properly executed" under the Local Government Code is essential to a waiver of a government unit's immunity, so it is jurisdictional, not merely a merits defense. Because a charter school district's governing board did not approve the lease, it was not properly executed [El Paso Educ. Initiative, Inc. v. Amex Props., LLC, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1166 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 270, Construction Contracts, § 270.01[5][b].

Security Interests; Subrogation. A lender's right to equitable subrogation is fixed at the moment the prior, valid lien is discharged, so any subsequent events are disregarded and do not affect the lender's right [Fed. Home Loan Mortg. Corp. v. Zepeda,

63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 904 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 255, *Real Property Security Interests*, § 255.06[3].

Real Estate Sales Contracts; Statute of Frauds. Because an easement is an interest in real estate, a contract for the sale of an easement is subject to the statute of frauds. A series of emails exchanged between the parties were not an enforceable contract because they were simply negotiations over a potential *future* contract [Copano Energy, LLC v. Bujnoch, 593 S.W.3d 721 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 252, *Real Estate Sales Contracts*, § 252.02[2], [5].

Deeds; Interest Conveyed. For a conveyance by special warranty deed, the covenant of seisin is implied, but is limited to those failures or defects of title that are not excluded by the terms of the special warranty [Chi. Title Ins. Co. v. Cochran Invs., Inc., 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 1421 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 254, Deeds, §§ 254.02, 254.04[8], 254.112[1].

Beds of Bodies of Water. The "Small Bill" enacted in 1929 validated prior land patents and awards that conveyed the beds of navigable waterways, regardless of whether the disputed portion of the bed is above or below the tide line [Bush v. Lone Oak Club, LLC, 63 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 820 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch 280, Adjoining Landowners, § 280.01[1].

Easements; Scope of Express Agreement. An express utility easement entitled the holder to access as much of the property as was reasonably necessary to accomplish its pur-

poses, so fixing the easement at the original 30-foot width and barring expansion was erroneous [Sw. Elec. Power Co. v. Lynch, 595 S.W.3d 678 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 281, *Easements*, §§ 281.03[1][b], 281.06[1][a].

Oil and Gas Leases; Royalty Interest. If an assignment of a royalty interest unambiguously conveys the assignor's overriding royalty interest in all production under the lease, it will be given that effect, even if, at the time of the assignment, only one well existed on a certain section of the leased premises [Piranha Partners v. Neuhoff, 596 S.W.3d 740 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch 283, *Oil and Gas Leases*, § 283.01[2][b].

Reformation; Rule Against Perpetuities. Under Property Code Section 5.043, a court must consider whether reformation of a deed or other instrument can save a conveyed interest that violates the Rule Against Perpetuities. This is a free-standing mandate that applies to what relief the court must order, so the parties' failure to seek reformation within the four-year limitations period applicable to a reformation action is inconsequential [Yowell v. Granite Operating Co., 2020 Tex. LEXIS 425 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 254, Deeds, § 254.04[8][a]; Ch 283, Oil and Gas Leases, § 283.02[1].

Estates

Determining Intent of Testator. By examining extrinsic evidence of the surrounding circumstances, including earlier agreements that expressly stated that mineral interests were not included in references to the ranch in a will, the Texas Supreme Court found the testator intended only to devise the surface estate [ConocoPhillips Co. v. Ramirez, 599 S.W.3d 296, 300–302 (Tex. 2020)]. See Ch. 394, *Will Construction*, § 394.03[4].

Administrative Law

Exception to Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Requirement. This release includes White

Deer Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Martin, 596 S.W.3d 855, 862 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2019, pet. denied), in which the court of appeals held that when the material facts are not in dispute, and the only issue is purely a question of law, exhaustion of administrative remedies is not required. See Ch. 423, Judicial Review of Contested Cases, § 423.02[3][a].

Matthew Bender provides continuing customer support for all its products:

- Editorial assistance—please consult the "Questions About This Publication" directory printed on the copyright page;
- Customer Service—missing pages, shipments, billing or other customer

service matters, +1.800.833.9844.

- Outside the United States and Canada, +1.937.247.0293, or fax (+1.800.828.8341) or email (international@bender.com);
- Toll-free ordering (+1.800.223.1940) or visit www.lexisnexis.com/BrowseUs.



www.lexis.com

Copyright © 2020 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group. Publication 719, Release 139, November 2020

LexisNexis, the knowledge burst logo, and Michie are trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender is a registered trademark of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

FILING INSTRUCTIONS

DORSANEO, TEXAS LITIGATION GUIDE

Publication 719 Release 139 November 2020

Check As Done	
	1. Check the Title page in the front of your present Volume 1. It should indicate that your set is filed through Release Number 138. If the set is current, proceed with the filing of this release. If your set is not filed through Release Number 138, DO NOT file this release. Please call Customer Services at 1-800-833-9844 for assistance in bringing your set up to date.
	2. Separate this Release Number 139 into the following groups of material:
	Package 1 contains White Revision pages for Volume 1 through Volume 18
	Package 2 contains White Revision pages for Volumes 19 through Volume 26
	Arrange these groups of material next to each other so that you can take material from each group as required and proceed with the filing of this release.
	3. Circulate the "Publication Update" among those individuals interested in the contents of this release.

DORSANEO, TEXAS LITIGATION GUIDE (USPS 018-383) is published 4 times per year for \$10,605.00 by Matthew Bender & Company Inc., 555 Middlecreek Parkway Colorado Springs, CO 80921. Periodical postage is paid at Easton, MD and at additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to DORSANEO, TEXAS LITIGATION GUIDE, 4810 Williamsburg Road, Unit 2, Hurlock, MD 21643.

Check As Done Remove Old Pages Numbered

Insert New Pages Numbered

For faster and easier filing, all references are to right-hand pages only.

VOLUME 1

Revision		
	1 thru xiii. 1-7. 2-7 thru 2-11 2-21 thru 2-43 2-59 thru 2-65 3-45 3-156.1 thru 3-163 11-9 11-44.1 thru 11-55.	1 thru xv 1-7 2-7 thru 2-11 2-21 thru 2-44.1 2-59 thru 2-65 3-45 thru 3-46.1 3-157 thru 3-163 11-9 thru 11-10.1 11-45 thru 11-56.1
	VOLUME 2	
Revision	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii
Tab Card	20. Tort Damages Tab Card (preceding page 20-1)	Material not replaced
Revision	20-1 thru 20-153	Material not replaced
Tab Card	21. Contract Damages Tab Card (preceding page 21-1)	Material not replaced
Revision	21-1 thru 21-97	Material not replaced
Tab Card	21A. Quasi-Contract Actions Tab Card (preceding page 21A-1)	Material not replaced
Revision	21A-1 thru 21A-45	Material not replaced

Check As Done	Remove Old Pages Numbered	Insert New Pages Numbered
Tab Card	1	
	22. Attorney's Fees Tab Card (preceding page 22-1)	Material not replaced
Revision		
	22-1 thru 22-123	Material not replaced
	30-11 thru 30-12.3	30-11 thru 30-12.3
	VOLUME 3	
Revision		
	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii
	40-49	40-49
	41-43	41-43
	42-63 thru 42-65	42-63 thru 42-65
	43-23	43-23 thru 43-24.1
	43-55	43-55
	43-107 thru 43-109	43-107 thru 43-109
	44-21 thru 44-44.3	44-21 thru 44-44.5
	44-135 thru 44-145	44-135 thru 44-146.1 45-11 thru 45-14.1
	45-11 thru 45-14.1	45-23 thru 45-46.7
	45-81 thru 45-89	45-81 thru 45-89
		01 4114 05
	VOLUME 4	
Revision		
	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii
	50-53 thru 50-55	50-53 thru 50-55
	50-66.1 thru 50-68.1	50-67 thru 50-68.1
	51-51 thru 51-55	51-51 thru 51-56.1
	52-59 thru 52-69	52-59 thru 52-69
	53-5 thru 53-7	53-5 thru 53-7 53-29 thru 53-31
П	54-23 thru 54-27	54-23 thru 54-27
	55-33 thru 55-43	55-33 thru 55-43
	VOLUME 5	
Revision		
	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii

Check As Done	Remove Old Pages Numbered	Insert New Pages Numbered
	VOLUME 6	
Revision		
	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii
	VOLUME 7	
Revision		
	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii 101-54.11 thru 101-54.14(1) 103-21 thru 103-22.1 103-44.3 thru 103-44.5 103-85 thru 103-89
	VOLUME 8	
Revision	Title page	Title page 120-7 thru 120-8.1 122-1 thru 122-2.1 122-13 thru 122-23 122-35 thru 122-36.1 122-65 thru 122-66.1 123-39 thru 123-40.1
D		
Revision	Title page	Title page 152-9 thru 152-11 152-37 thru 152-40.5 152-47 thru 152-48.1 152-123 thru 152-129
	VOLUME 11	
Revision	Title page	Title page 162-31 thru 162-32.5

Check As Done	Remove Old Pages Numbered	Insert New Pages Numbered
	VOLUME 12	
Revision	Title page	Title page 182-21 thru 182-22.1 191-19 thru 191-20.1
Danisian		
Revision	Title page	Title page 200-25 thru 200-26.1 200-69 thru 200-70.1 200B-45 thru 200B-50.1 201-5 thru 201-6.1 203-28.1 thru 203-28.5 203-83 thru 203-84.1 203A-25 thru 203A-26.1 203A-93 thru 203A-94.1 203A-121 thru 203A-122.3 203A-219 203A-239 thru 203A-240.1
	VOLUME 14	
Revision	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii
	210A-19 thru 210A-22.1	210A-19 thru 210A-22.1
	210A-53 thru 210A-54.1	210A-33 thru 210A-34.1 210A-67 thru 210A-68.2(1)
	210A-86.1 thru 210A-88.1	210A-87 thru 210A-88.1
	210A-117 thru 210A-121	210A-117 thru 210A-122.1
	210A-165	210A-165 thru 210A-166.1
	No Material removed	217-1 thru 217-107 (file preceding "220. Deceptive Trade Practice" tab card)
	No Material removed	218-1 thru 218-45 (file preceding "220. Deceptive Trade Practice" tab card)
	220A-21 thru 220A-22.1	220A-21 thru 220A-22.1

VOLUME 15

Check As Done	Remove Old Pages Numbered	Insert New Pages Numbered
Revision	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii 230-45 thru 230-46.1
Revision	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii 235-35 thru 235-36.1
Revision	Title page	Title page 251-16.7 thru 251-16.11 252-31 thru 252-34.15 254-7 thru 254-10.1 254-28.9 thru 254-28.17 254-85 thru 254-86.1 255-53 thru 255-54.1
Revision	Title page	Title page 270-21 thru 270-28.2(5) 280-13 thru 280-14.1 281-17 thru 281-18.1 281-53 thru 281-56.3 283-13 thru 283-20.3 283-44.9 thru 283-44.10(1) 283-83 thru 283-84.1 285-23 thru 285-26.2(1) 285-26.13 thru 285-26.19
Revision	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii 290-19 thru 290-20.1

FI-6

Check As Done	Remove Old Pages Numbered	Insert New Pages Numbered
	290-64.1 thru 290-66.2(1)	290-65 thru 290-66.2(7) 290-77 thru 290-78.1 291-35 thru 291-36.1 293-22.1 thru 293-22.4(1) 293-37 thru 293-46.3 293-69 thru 293-70.2(1) 293-106.5 thru 293-106.11 293-121 thru 293-122.1 293-135 thru 293-136.8(2)(b)(iii) 294-1 thru 294-179 (file preceding "300. Operator's Liability" tab card) 295-1 thru 295-131 (file preceding "300. Operator's Liability" tab card)
	300-19 thru 300-22.1	300-19 thru 300-22.1 300-71 thru 300-72.1 301-3 thru 301-10.1 310-42.1 311-25 thru 311-28.1
	VOLUME 20	
Revision	Title page thru iii	Title page thru iii 321-29 thru 321-30.2(1) 321-30.11 thru 321-30.16(1) 321-91 thru 321-94.3 321-111 thru 321-116.7 322-37 thru 322-38.17 331-29 thru 331-30.7 333-19 thru 333-34.1 333-77 thru 333-82.1 333-88.29 thru 333-88.30(1)
	VOLUME 21	

Check As Done	Remove Old Pages Numbered	Insert New Pages Numbered
	345-93 thru 345-94.3	345-93 thru 345-94.3 350-5 thru 350-33 351-23 thru 351-46.3 351-51 thru 351-52.1 351-61 thru 351-99
	VOLUME 22	
Revision	Title page. 360-65 thru 360-66.1 360-81 thru 360-84.1 360A-40.1 thru 360A-42.3 361-23 thru 361-25 362-102.1 thru 362-102.9 362-117 364-30.1 thru 364-39 370-1 thru 370-5 370-30.1 370-60.1 thru 370-60.5 370-70.5 thru 370-70.11 371-6.1 thru 371-8.1 371-28.1 thru 371-50.1 371-107 thru 371-123 371-131 thru 371-133	Title page 360-65 360-81 thru 360-83 360A-41 thru 360A-42.9 361-23 thru 361-25 362-102.1 thru 362-102.9 362-117 364-31 thru 370-5 370-30.1 thru 370-60.5 370-70.5 thru 370-70.11 371-7 thru 371-8.1 371-29 thru 371-50.7 371-107 thru 371-124.5 371-131 thru 371-133 371A-69 thru 371A-71
	VOLUME 23	
Revision	Title page	Title page 372-113 thru 372-125 373-3 thru 373-5 373-35 thru 373-64.9 373-91 thru 373-94.1 374-19 thru 374-20.5 380-51 thru 380-54.1 382-71 thru 382-89

VOLUME 24

Check As	Remove Old	Insert New
As Done	Pages Numbered	Pages Numbered
Revision		
	Title page	Title page
	391-42.15	391-42.15
	392-102.1 thru 392-103	392-103 thru 392-104.1
	392-175 thru 392-177	392-175 thru 392-177
	393-60.1 thru 393-63	393-61 thru 393-64.1
	394-25	394-25 thru 394-26.1
	394-83 thru 394-85	394-83 thru 394-85
	394-103 thru 394-107	394-103 thru 394-107
	402-27 thru 402-29	402-27 thru 402-29
	410-102.7 thru 410-102.11	410-102.7 thru 410-102.11
	415-61 thru 415-63	415-61 thru 415-63
	VOLUME 25	
	VOLUME 20	
Revision		
	Title mage	Title mass
	Title page	Title page 421-23 thru 421-24.1
	422-30.1 thru 422-32.1	422-31 thru 422-32.1
П	423-11 thru 423-16.1	423-11 thru 423-16.1
П	423-37 thru 423-38.3	423-37 thru 423-38.3
П	424-21	424-21
	424-33 thru 424-35	424-33 thru 424-35
	424 33 tilu 424 33	424 33 tinu 424 33
	VOLUME 26	
Revision		
	Title page	Title page
	I-89 thru I-95	I-89 thru I-96.1
П	I-125 thru I-133	I-125 thru I-134.1
	I-221 thru I-251	I-221 thru I-252.1
	I-287 thru I-305	I-287 thru I-306.1
	I-455 thru I-473	I-455 thru I-471
	I-573 thru I-589	I-573 thru I-589
	I-659 thru I-689	I-659 thru I-690.1
	I-751 thru I-757	I-751 thru I-758.1
	I-805 thru i-809	I-805 thru I-809
	I-853 thru I-879	I-853 thru I-880.1
	I-999 thru I-1013	I-999 thru I-1013
	I-1057 thru I-1069	I-1057 thru I-1069
	I-853 thru I-879	I-805 thru I-809 I-853 thru I-880.1
	I-1057 thru I-1069	I-1057 thru I-1069

FILE IN THE FRONT OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF YOUR SET

To order missing pages log on to our self service center, www.lexisnexis.com/printcdsc or call Customer Services at 1 (800) 833-9844 and have the following information ready:

- (1) the publication title;
- (2) specific volume, chapter and page numbers; and
- (3) your name, phone number, and Matthew Bender account number.

Please recycle removed pages.

MISSING FILING INSTRUCTIONS? FIND THEM AT www.lexisnexis.com/printcdsc

Use the search tool provided to find and download missing filing instructions, or sign on to the Print & CD Service Center to order missing pages or replacement materials. Visit us soon to see what else the Print & CD Service Center can do for you!



www.lexis.com

Copyright © 2020 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group. Publication 719, Release 139, November 2020

LexisNexis, the knowledge burst logo, and Michie are trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender is a registered trademark of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.