

Case Summaries: October 2018 Executive Committee Closed Session Agenda

| | |
|---|--|
| Style of Case on Appeal: | <i>League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Edwards Aquifer Auth.</i> , No. 18-50655 (5 th Cir. Aug. 9, 2018) |
| Style of Case in Trial Court: | <i>League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Edwards Aquifer Auth.</i> , No. 5:12-CV-00620 (W.D. Tex. July 25, 2018) |
| EAA Status in Case: | Party |
| Nature of Case: | Equal Protection (one-person, one-vote) and Voting Rights Act suit |
| Date Filed: | June 21, 2012 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | LULAC and three individuals sued the EAA and the Texas Secretary of State asserting claims for declaratory and injunctive relief to enforce the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act due to the unequal populations comprising the EAA's single-member districts and the underrepresentation of minority-majority EAA districts. Another claim challenged the EAA's alleged failure to seek preclearance approval of its 2012 Redistricting Plan prior to its Nov. 2012 election. After the EAA received preclearance on Nov. 27, 2012, LULAC dropped this claim. SAWS intervened as a plaintiff on the one-person, one-vote Equal Protection claim. The City of San Marcos, the County of Uvalde, the City of Uvalde, New Braunfels Utilities and the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority intervened as defendant-intervenors. The City of Victoria and current and former EAA directors filed an amicus brief supporting the EAA. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | July 25, 2018 |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | On June 18, 2018, the judge granted the EAA's motion for partial summary judgment and denied Plaintiffs' motion for partial summary judgment, finding that the EAA is a special purpose district with limited purpose and scope to fulfill the EAA Act, and not a general purpose governmental body, and, therefore, the EAA is not subject to OPOV. Further, the judge found that the EAA's directors' districts have a rational basis as they are balanced to reflect the different water interests in the region that are disproportionately impacted by the EAA. The court dismissed LULAC's Section 2 claim without prejudice. |
| Date Appeal Filed: | Aug. 9, 2018 |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | LULAC has appealed the granting of the EAA's motion for partial summary judgment. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Appeals Court: | |
| Summary of Appellate Court Disposition: | |
| Case Status: | Pending |

| | |
|---|---|
| Style of Case in Trial Court: | <i>Uvalde Cty. Underground Water Conservation Dist. v. Edwards Aquifer Auth.</i> , No. 2018-01-31972-CV (38 th Dist. Ct., Uvalde Cty., Tex. Jan. 16, 2018) |
| Style of Case on Appeal: | |
| EAA Status in Case: | Party |
| Nature of Case: | Declaratory judgment action |
| Date Filed: | Jan. 16, 2018 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | The Uvalde County Underground Water Conservation District and George and Carolyn Ligoocky seek a declaratory judgment declaring that the adoption of the EAA's rules allowing base irrigation groundwater conversion based on land use was ultra vires. The City of Uvalde and Uvalde County have both intervened in the lawsuit on the side of the District. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | |
| Date Appeal Filed: | |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | |
| Date of Final Disposition in Appeals Court: | |
| Summary of Appellate Court Disposition: | |
| Case Status: | Pending |

| | |
|---|--|
| Style of Case in Trial Court: | <i>Gibson v. Edwards Aquifer Auth.</i> , No. 2018CVB0340 (Co. Ct. at Law No. 2, Comal Cty., Tex. June 1, 2018) |
| Style of Case on Appeal: | |
| EAA Status in Case: | Party |
| Nature of Case: | Wrongful discharge action |
| Date Filed: | June 1, 2018 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | Shaun Gibson, a former EAA employee, alleges he was discriminated against on the basis of his national origin (English), his religion (Catholic) and his age (48) when he was discharged from his position as Director of Information Technology at the EAA on May 19, 2017, and seeks damages in the form of back pay, front pay, compensatory damages (primarily mental anguish and emotional distress) and attorney fees. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | |
| Date Appeal Filed: | |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | |
| Date of Final Disposition in Appeals Court: | |
| Summary of Appellate Court Disposition: | |
| Case Status: | Pending |

| | |
|---|---|
| Style of Case on Appeal: | <i>Abbott v. Perez</i> , No. 17-626, 2018 WL 3096311 (U.S. 2018); <i>Perry v. Perez</i> , 565 U.S. 1090 (2011) and <i>Davis v. Abbott</i> , 781 F.3d 207 (5 th Cir. 2015), inter alia |
| Style of Case in Trial Court: | <i>Perez v. Abbott</i> , No. 11-CV-360 (W.D. Tex. May 9, 2011) |
| EAA Status in Case: | Monitoring |
| Nature of Case: | Challenge to Texas' federal congressional and state legislative and Board of Education districts under U.S. Constitutional and Voting Rights Act |
| Date Filed: | May 9, 2011 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | Voters and legislators seek to invalidate Texas electoral districts on the basis of racial gerrymandering and vote dilution and to have court adopt new electoral districts. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | Interim redistricting plan for congressional and state house elections and state senate elections issued and later vacated. Court ultimately found three U.S. Congressional districts were unconstitutional. |
| Date Appeal Filed: | Oct. 19, 2017 |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | Appeal of district court decisions |
| Date of Final Disposition in Supreme Court: | June 25, 2018 |
| Summary of Supreme Court Disposition: | Supreme Court reversed the district's court's finding that 10 districts unconstitutionally discriminated against black and Latino voters on the basis of race and affirmed the finding that 1 district, HD 90, was unconstitutionally racially gerrymandered. |
| Case Status: | Pending |

| | |
|---|--|
| Style of Case at Trial Court: | <i>In re Estate of Eva May Sanderlin</i> , No. 6831-15 (Cty. Ct., Uvalde Cty., Tex. Jan. 8, 2015) |
| Style of Case on Appeal: | |
| EAA Status in Case: | Monitoring |
| Nature of Case: | Probate |
| Date Filed: | Jan. 8, 2015 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | Ted Sanderlin, son of EAA permittees who are now deceased, applied to probate his mother's will. Prior to his mother's death, the EAA had approved a transfer of the permit to Ted, however, it appears that at the time, at least some of the mother's interest in the permitted rights was only a life estate. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | |
| Date Appeal Filed: | |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | |
| Date of Final Disposition in Appeals Court: | |
| Summary of Appellate Court Disposition: | |
| Date Petition Filed with Supreme Court: | |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | |
| Date of Final Disposition in Supreme Court: | |
| Summary of Supreme Court Disposition: | |
| Case Status: | Pending |

| | |
|---|--|
| Style of Case in Trial Court: | <i>City of Conroe v. Tramm</i> , No. 15-08-08942 (284 th Dist. Ct., Montgomery Cty., Tex. Aug. 31, 2015) |
| Style of Case on Appeal: | <i>Lone Star Groundwater Conservation Dist. v. City of Conroe</i> , No. 09-16-201-CV (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2017) |
| EAA Status in Case: | Monitoring |
| Nature of Case: | City of Conroe and water utilities filed a declaratory suit against a groundwater conservation district and its individual directors challenging the district's regulatory plan, DFCs and rules as ultra vires and a taking |
| Date Filed: | Aug. 31, 2015 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | Plaintiffs seek a declaration that the district's regulatory plan and rules are ultra vires because they regulate withdrawals per user and were not adopted in accordance with Ch. 36 of the Water Code and they challenge the validity of the district's plan and rules as constituting a taking and they seek their invalidation. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | May 24, 2016 (interlocutory order) |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | The trial court denied the District's plea to the jurisdiction. |
| Date Appeal Filed: | June 6, 2016 (interlocutory) |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | District and directors raised issues of whether District has immunity from ultra vires claims not against individuals, UDJA allows challenge to District rules, and redundant remedies doctrine bars claim for attorney's fees for claims brought under both Water Code and UDJA. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Appeals Court: | Feb. 2, 2017 (interlocutory) |
| Summary of Appellate Court Disposition: | The court held that although the City of Conroe could file suit under both Sec. 36.251 of the Water Code and the UDJA, the UDJA does not waive the GCD's immunity from suit for attorney's fees, so the City's claim for attorney's fees was dismissed with prejudice. The court also ruled that Sec. 36.066(g), Water Code, provides directors with immunity from suit except for the three named exceptions (conflicts of interest, abuse of office and constitutional requirements) and because the City didn't claim any of those exceptions, their suit against the directors was dismissed with prejudice. The UDJA claim and attack on the validity of the GCD's rules under Sec. 36.251 will proceed but the opinion indicates that UDJA claim is essentially the same as the claim filed under Sec. 36.251, Water Code. |
| Case Status: | Pending |

| | |
|---|---|
| Style of Case in Trial Court: | <i>In re Estate of Watts</i> , No. 2016PC0277 (Prob. Ct. No. 1, Bexar Cty., Tex. Jan. 27, 2016) |
| Style of Case on Appeal: | |
| EAA Status in Case: | Monitoring |
| Nature of Case: | Probate action |
| Date Filed: | Jan. 27, 2016 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | Edwards permitted rights are sought to be partitioned in probate matter. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | |
| Date Appeal Filed: | |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | |
| Date of Final Disposition in Appeals Court: | |
| Summary of Appellate Court Disposition: | |
| Case Status: | Pending |

| | |
|---|--|
| Style of Case at SOAH/District: | <i>Flying "L" Guest Ranch, Ltd. v. Bandera Cty. River Auth. & Groundwater Dist.</i> , No. CVOC-18-0000015 (198 th Dist. Ct., Bandera Cty, Tex. Jan. 12, 2018) |
| Style of Case in Trial Court: | |
| EAA Status in Case: | Monitoring |
| Nature of Case: | Appeal of district permitting decision and takings case |
| Date Filed: | Jan. 12, 2018 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | FLGR Guest Ranch, Ltd. ("FLGR") appeals the District's administrative amendment of 7 groundwater production permits and seeks compensation for an alleged unconstitutional taking of its property. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | |
| Date Appeal Filed: | |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | |
| Date of Final Disposition in Appeals Court: | |
| Summary of Appellate Court Disposition: | |
| Case Status: | Pending |

| | |
|---|--|
| Style of Case in Trial Court: | <i>End Op, L.P. v. Meyer</i> , No. 03-18-49-CV, 2018 WL 4102013 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 29, 2018) |
| Style of Case on Appeal: | <i>Meyer v. Lost Pines Groundwater Conservation Dist.</i> , No. 29,696 (21st Dist. Ct., Bastrop Cty., Tex. Jan. 4, 2018) |
| EAA Status in Case: | Monitoring |
| Nature of Case: | Challenge to contested case hearing on permit application |
| Date Filed: | Nov. 7, 2014 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | Four plaintiff landowners' and Environmental Stewardship appeal their denial of party status in a contested case hearing on End Op's permit granted in 2016, and, if so, whether the district needs to allow a new CCH to go forward which would include these plaintiff landowners and Environmental Stewardship. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | Jan. 4, 2018 |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | Court reversed the District's denial of request for party status and the District's order issuing permits to End Op, L.P. as a result, and remanded the matter to the District. |
| Date Appeal Filed: | Jan. 24, 2018 |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | District and applicant appeal trial court decision reversing District decision. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Appeals Court: | Aug. 29, 2018 |
| Summary of Appellate Court Disposition: | The appeals court reversed the district court's finding that it had jurisdiction as plaintiff landowners and Environmental Stewardship failed to wait for a final agency decision on their motion for rehearing of the district's permitting decision and, therefore, failed to exhaust administrative remedies, and dismissed the case. |
| Case Status: | Closed |

| | |
|---|---|
| Style of Case in Trial Court: | <i>Stratta v. Roe</i> , No. 6:18-CV-00114 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 13, 2018) |
| Style of Case on Appeal: | |
| EAA Status in Case: | Monitoring |
| Nature of Case: | Section 1983 suit on 1 st Amendment, equal protection and taking |
| Date Filed: | Apr. 13, 2018 |
| Summary of Causes of Action: | Plaintiff, a district board member and landowner, and another landowner plaintiff sued district directors and district in federal court under 42 U.S.C. sec. 1983 for a violation of the First Amendment for not allowing the board member to speak during public comment period, equal protection for treating water purveyors differently than other landowners, and alleging a taking for not allowing landowner to offset draining to his well or allowing him to obtain a permit for his fair share. |
| Date of Final Disposition in Trial Court: | |
| Summary of Trial Court Disposition: | |
| Date Appeal Filed: | |
| Summary of Issues on Appeal: | |
| Date of Final Disposition in Appeals Court: | |
| Summary of Appellate Court Disposition: | |
| Case Status: | Pending |