

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS

Garry L. Rollins and Carla D. Rollins v. Texas College and MPF Investments, LLC d/b/a "A-1 Rent All"

Rollins v. Texas College · No. 12-15-00121-CV · Decided December 15, 2015

SUMMARY

This document is Texas College's second unopposed motion to extend the deadline for filing its appellee's brief in an appeal before the Twelfth Court of Appeals of Texas. It requests a 30-day extension, until January 15, 2016, based on counsel's workload and the need for client review and approval.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Twelfth Court of Appeals of Texas
JURISDICTION	Texas
DECIDED	December 15, 2015
DOCKET	12-15-00121-CV
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	An appeal was pending in the Twelfth Court of Appeals from the Seventh Judicial District Court of Smith County, Texas. Appellee Texas College filed an unopposed second motion to extend the deadline for filing its appellee's brief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Garry L. Rollins, Carla D. Rollins v. Texas College, MPF Investments, LLC d/b/a "A-1 Rent All"

TOPICS

appellate procedure

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

appellate procedure

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Texas College should receive a 30-day extension of the deadline for filing its appellee's brief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Counsel is unable to complete the brief and secure the necessary client review and approval by the current deadline.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Texas College's appellee brief was due on December 16, 2015. Its lead appellate counsel stated that additional time was needed to complete the brief and obtain client review and approval while also working on other appellate and summary-judgment matters. The motion represented that the request was unopposed and was not made solely for delay.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was appealed from the Seventh Judicial District Court of Smith County, Texas. While the appeal was pending, Texas College requested a second 30-day extension of the appellee's briefing deadline, from December 16, 2015, through January 15, 2016. The document states that opposing counsel did not oppose the requested extension, but it does not include a ruling on the motion.