

FIFTEENTH COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS

State of Texas v. Arity 875, LLC

State v. Arity 875 · No. 15-25-00082-CV · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is Arity 875, LLC’s response letter to the Texas Fifteenth Court of Appeals regarding the State’s notice of supplemental authority in State v. Arity 875, LLC. The letter distinguishes State v. Yelp, Inc. and argues that Yelp supports affirmance of the trial court’s ruling, including on purposeful availment and the limits of pleadings-based jurisdictional allegations.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Fifteenth Court of Appeals of Texas
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	15-25-00082-CV
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appellee Arity 875, LLC submitted a response letter addressing the State's notice of supplemental authority in an interlocutory appeal involving a special appearance and personal jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The response cites the rule that, when a trial court makes no findings of fact or conclusions of law, appellate courts presume that factual disputes were resolved in favor of the trial court's decision unless challenged on appeal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	none; the source is an appellee's response letter rather than a court opinion
PARTIES	State of Texas v. Arity 875, LLC

TOPICS

- personal jurisdiction
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure
- personal jurisdiction
- commercial litigation

KEY QUOTATIONS

“when the trial court does not issue factual findings or legal conclusions, as here, “we presume all factual disputes were resolved in favor of the trial court’s decision unless they are challenged on appeal.”” (*3)

*“allegations supporting jurisdiction must be included in the petition—not asserted elsewhere.” (*4, *5)*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The State challenged personal jurisdiction over Arity 875, LLC, apparently based on allegedly location-targeted advertising or related contacts with Texas. Arity 875 asserted that it did not own or operate a website or application directed to Texas, did not display advertisements to its own user base, and had no employees in Texas. The response distinguished *State v. Yelp, Inc.*, where the defendant allegedly posted a consumer notice on Texas business pages and had employees in Texas.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The document is a response to a notice of supplemental authority filed in an appeal from the Texas 457th Judicial District Court. Arity 875 argued that *State v. Yelp, Inc.* was distinguishable and supported affirmance of the trial court's ruling. The document does not state the appellate court's disposition of the underlying appeal.

CASES CITED

- *State v. Yelp, Inc.*, No. 15-24-00040-CV, 2025 WL 2936466 (Tex. App. [15th Dist.] Oct. 16, 2025)
- *UMG Recordings, Inc. v. Kurbanov*, 963 F.3d 344 (4th Cir. 2020)
- *Mavrix Photo, Inc. v. Brand Techs., Inc.*, 647 F.3d 1218 (9th Cir. 2011)