

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AT FORT WORTH

Darryl Heffner v. Janelle Haverkamp, Paul Wright, the Wright Law Firm, L.L.P., Charles Beachley, Beachley Smith P.L.L.C., Christopher Henry, Minor & Jester, P.C., and Tiffany Wright

No. 02-25-00472-CV (Tex. App.—Fort Worth June 11, 2026) · No. No. 02-25-00472-CV · Decided June 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals for the Second Appellate District affirmed the trial court’s final judgment dismissing Darryl Heffner’s claims against the appellees. The court held that the judgment was final because it disposed of all claims and parties, and it further held that Heffner waived his appellate issues through inadequate briefing. The underlying claims included fraud, breach of fiduciary duty and trust, and quiet-title or trespass-to-try-title claims.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mike Wallach; Kerr; Bassel; Wallach
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Second Appellate District of Texas
DECIDED	June 11, 2026
DOCKET	No. 02-25-00472-CV
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appellant appealed from a final judgment dismissing his claims with prejudice after the trial court granted appellees' pleas to the jurisdiction based on immunity and lack of standing and denied appellant's Rule 12 motion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Darryl Heffner v. Janelle Haverkamp, Paul Wright, The Wright Law Firm, L.L.P., Charles Beachley, Beachley Smith P.L.L.C., Christopher Henry, Minor & Jester, P.C., Tiffany Wright

TOPICS

appellate procedure

final judgment rule

waiver

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

appellate procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court's Final Judgment was final and appealable.
2. Whether Heffner adequately briefed his appellate complaints or waived them by failing to provide coherent argument, substantive analysis, and appropriate citations.

HOLDINGS

1. The Final Judgment was final for purposes of appeal because it expressly stated that it was a final judgment disposing globally and completely of all claims between the parties, and the record confirmed that all claims had been dismissed, nonsuited, or severed.
2. Heffner waived his appellate issues because his briefing was confusing, disjointed, and largely unsupported by cogent argument, substantive analysis, and appropriate citations to authorities and the record.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Final Judgment in this case recites that it is "meant to be Final Judgment globally and completely disposing of all claims between the parties asserted in this cause number." (at 5)

"We hold that Appellant has waived his Issues on appeal." (at 9)

"Having concluded that the Final Judgment is final for purposes of appeal and having held that Appellant has waived his Issues on appeal, we affirm the judgment of the trial court." (at 9)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Heffner sued a judge and attorneys and law firms involved in earlier probate and civil litigation concerning his wife's estate and a family lawsuit. He sought declaratory and injunctive relief and asserted claims including fraud, breach of fiduciary duty and trust, and quiet title or trespass to try title. The appellees asserted immunity-based pleas to the jurisdiction, and the judge also asserted that Heffner lacked standing to sue her. Heffner did not respond to the pleas or attend the hearing at which they were granted.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Heffner filed suit seeking declaratory and injunctive relief and asserting various tort and title-related claims. The trial court granted appellees' pleas to the jurisdiction, dismissed Heffner's claims with prejudice, found the petition facially groundless and in violation of Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Chapters 9 and 10 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 13, and later entered a final judgment after counterclaims were nonsuited and other claims were severed. Heffner's motion for new trial was overruled by operation of law. The court of

appeals held that the judgment was final and that Heffner waived his appellate issues through inadequate briefing, then affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Est. of Heffner, No. 02-21-00419-CV, 2023 WL 3876760, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth June 8, 2023, pet. denied)
- S.W. ex rel A.W. v. Arlington ISD, 435 S.W.3d 414, 419 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2014, no pet.)
- Britton v. Tex. Dep't of Crim. Just., 95 S.W.3d 676, 681 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2002, no pet.)
- Reyna v. M&J Carriers, LLC, No. 04-24-00200-CV, 2025 WL 3019173, at *1 (Tex. App.—San Antonio Oct. 29, 2025, no pet.)
- Guardianship of Jones, 629 S.W.3d 921, 924 (Tex. 2021)
- Patel v. Nations Renovations, LLC, 661 S.W.3d 151, 154-55 (Tex. 2023)
- Bella Palma, LLC v. Young, 601 S.W.3d 799, 801 (Tex. 2020)
- Sealy Emergency Room, L.L.C. v. Free Standing Emergency Room Managers of Am., L.L.C., 685 S.W.3d 816, 820 (Tex. 2024)
- Diversified Fin. Sys., Inc. v. Hill, Heard, O'Neal, Gilstrap & Goetz, P.C., 63 S.W.3d 795, 795 (Tex. 2001)
- Castro v. Am. Express Nat'l Bank, No. 02-23-00196-CV, 2024 WL 3059046, at *3 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth June 20, 2024, no pet.)
- Brown v. Tex. Emp. Comm'n, 801 S.W.2d 5, 8 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1990, writ denied)
- Maddox v. Hutchens, No. 2-02-159-CV, 2003 WL 21983260, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Aug. 21, 2003, no pet.)
- Bailey v. Rogers, 631 S.W.2d 784, 786 (Tex. App.—Austin 1982, no writ)
- Smale v. Williams, 590 S.W.3d 633, 639 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 2019, no pet.)
- Paselk v. Rabun, 293 S.W.3d 600, 611 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 2009, pet. denied)
- In re J.D., No. 02-24-00515-CV, 2025 WL 2810523, at *2 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Oct. 2, 2025, no pet.)
- In re A.N.G., 631 S.W.3d 471, 476 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2021, no pet.)
- Valadez v. Avitia, 238 S.W.3d 843, 845 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2007, no pet.)
- Carr v. Claudio, No. 01-22-00815-CV, 2024 WL 3187354, at *4 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] June 27, 2024, no pet.)
- Marin Real Est. Partners, L.P. v. Vogt, 373 S.W.3d 57, 75 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2011, no pet.)
- Cervantes-Peterson v. Tex. Dep't of Fam. & Protective Servs., 221 S.W.3d 244, 255 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, no pet.)
- Huey v. Huey, 200 S.W.3d 851, 854 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2006, no pet.)
- Kennedy v. Staples, 336 S.W.3d 745, 754 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 2011, no pet.)

- Golden v. Milstead Towing & Storage, Nos. 09-21-00043-CV, 09-21-00044-CV, 09-21-00045-CV, 2022 WL 1412303, at *2, *4 (Tex. App.—Beaumont May 5, 2022, no pet.)
- Massey v. Royall, No. 14-02-01260-CV, 2004 WL 114989, at *1 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Jan. 27, 2004, no pet.)
- Shockley v. Yalk, No. 07-22-00128-CV, 2023 WL 1993683, at *2 (Tex. App.—Amarillo Feb. 14, 2023, no pet.)
- Purse v. DeJesus, No. 01-17-00855-CV, 2019 WL 237751, at *2-3 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Jan. 17, 2019, no pet.)
- In re J.O.A.M., Nos. 01-23-00691-CV, 01-23-00692-CV, 2024 WL 1169432, at *23 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Mar. 19, 2024)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/court-of-appeals-for-the-second-appellate-district-of-texas-court-of-appeals-for-the-second-appellat/2026/darryl-heffner-v-janelle-haverkamp-paul-wright-the-wright-44m5fpn7>