

**CASE NO. 03-12-00579-CV**

---

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
THIRD DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN, TEXAS

---

ROBERT KINNEY,

Appellant and Cross-Appellee,

v.

BCG ATTORNEY SEARCH, INC. and  
PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY, INC., d/b/a LEGAL AUTHORITY,

Appellees and Cross-Appellants.

---

On Appeal from the 353<sup>rd</sup> Judicial District Court,  
Travis County, Texas

---

**BRIEF AND APPENDIX  
OF APPELLANT ROBERT KINNEY**

---

Martin J. Siegel  
State Bar No. 18342125  
LAW OFFICES OF MARTIN J. SIEGEL, P.C.  
Bank of America Center  
700 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Telephone: (713) 226-8566  
Martin@SiegelFirm.com  
*Counsel for Appellant*

**Oral Argument Requested**

## **IDENTITY OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL**

### **Appellant and Cross-Appellee:**

Robert Kinney

### **Counsel for Appellant and Cross-Appellee:**

Martin J. Siegel  
Law Offices of Martin J. Siegel, P.C.  
Bank of America Building  
700 Louisiana, Suite 2300  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Tel.: (713) 226-8566  
martin@siegelfirm.com

Greggory A. Teeter  
Teeter Law Firm  
325 N. St. Paul, Suite 2240  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Tel.: (972) 383-9839  
gteeter@teeterlawfirm.com

Robert E. Kinney, Esq.  
824 W. 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 202  
Austin, Texas 78701  
Tel.: (512) 233-0280  
robert@kinneyrecruiting.com

### **Appellees and Cross-Appellants:**

BCG Attorney Search, Inc.  
Professional Authority, Inc. d/b/a Legal Authority

**Counsel for Appellee and Cross-Appellants:**

Dale L. Roberts  
Daniel H. Byrne  
Eleanor Ruffner  
Fritz, Byrne, Head & Harrison, PLLC  
98 San Jacinto Blvd., Suite 2000  
Austin, TX 78701  
Tel.: (512) 476-2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

IDENTITY OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL .....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	iii
INDEX OF AUTHORITIES .....	v
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	1
STATEMENT REGARDING ORAL ARGUMENT .....	3
ISSUES PRESENTED .....	4
INTRODUCTION .....	5
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	6
I.    Kinney’s Post About Barnes and His Companies.....	6
II.   Plaintiffs’ First Case: The California Action .....	10
III.  Plaintiffs’ Second Try: The Arbitration.....	11
IV.  Plaintiffs’ Third Attempt: This Case .....	12
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....	15
ARGUMENT.....	16
I.    Standard of Review .....	16
II.   Texas’s SLAPP Statute .....	17
III.  Res Judicata Precludes Plaintiffs’ Claims .....	19
A.  The California Decision is Final, on the Merits, and Involved the Same Parties .....	20

B.	Res Judicata Applies Because BCG and Legal Authority Could Have Brought the Claims in This Case in Their California Action .....	23
IV.	BCG and Legal Authority Lack Clear and Specific Evidence of the Damages Element of Their Contract and Fiduciary Duty Claims.....	30
A.	The SLAPP Law Erects a High Evidentiary Barrier .....	30
B.	BCG and Legal Authority Lack Clear and Specific Evidence of Damages .....	31
1.	BCG’s and Legal Authority’s Damages Evidence is Inadequate .....	32
2.	Plaintiffs’ Scant Damages Evidence Flunks the Requirements of California Law .....	37
V.	BCG’s and Legal Authority’s Claims Are Barred by Limitations .....	43
	CONCLUSION AND PRAYER.....	46
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	47
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	48

## INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

Case	page
<i>Aguilera v. Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corp.</i> , 223 F.3d 1010 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000).....	42
<i>Allied Fire Protection v. Diede Construction, Inc.</i> , 127 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 150 (Cal. Ct. App. 2005).....	23, 25
<i>Anticancer, Inc. v. Novartis Pharm. Corp.</i> , 2003 WL 22422415 (Cal. Ct. App. 2003, rev. denied).....	39, 40
<i>Avina v. Spurlock</i> , 28 Cal. App. 3d 1086 (Cal. Ct. App. 1972).....	41
<i>Bullock v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.</i> , 198 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 543 (Cal. Ct. App. 2011, rev. denied).....	23
<i>Burdette v. Carrier Corp.</i> , 158 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 1668 (Cal. Ct. App. 2008, rev. denied).....	26, 28, 29
<i>Chen v. City of Houston</i> , 206 F.3d 502 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000), <i>cert. denied</i> , 532 U.S. 1046 (2001).....	36, 37
<i>Davis v. Prosperity Bank</i> , ___ S.W.3d ___, 2012 WL 5266117 (Tex. App. – Houston [14 <sup>th</sup> Dist.], October 25, 2012) .....	36
<i>Dealers Wholesale Supply, Inc. v. Pacific Steel and Supply Co.</i> , 1984 WL 775 (N.D. Cal. 1984), <i>aff'd</i> , 780 F.2d 1025 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985).....	40, 41
<i>Direct Shopping Network, LLC v. James</i> , 206 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 1551 (Cal. Ct. App. 2012) .....	39
<i>Eagle Broadband, Inc. v. Mould</i> , 2007 WL 4358515 (Cal. Ct. App. 2007) .....	39, 40

<i>Earle v. Ratliff</i> , 998 S.W.2d 882 (Tex. 1999).....	45
<i>Edenbaum v. Dalton</i> , 2002 WL 31474450 (Cal. Ct. App. 2002, rev. denied).....	42
<i>Flatly v. Mauro</i> , 39 Cal. 4 <sup>th</sup> 299 (Cal. 2006).....	21
<i>Frangipani v. Boecker</i> , 64 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 860 (Cal. Ct. App. 1998).....	38
<i>Gautier v. General Tel. Co.</i> , 234 Cal. App. 2d 302 (Cal. Ct. App. 1965).....	38
<i>Gill v. Hughes</i> , 227 Cal. App. 3d 1299 (Cal. Ct. App. 1991, rev. denied).....	26
<i>Grable v. Grable</i> , 180 Cal. App. 2d 353 (Cal. Ct. App.), <i>cert. denied</i> , 364 U.S. 892 (1960) .....	21
<i>Gulf Atlantic Life Ins. Co. v. Hurlbut</i> , 696 S.W.2d 83 (Tex. App. – Dallas 1985, rev'd on other grounds, 749 S.W.2d 762 (Tex. 1987)) .....	44, 45
<i>Gulvartian v. Fakhoury</i> , 2010 WL 2473865 (Cal. Ct. App. 2010) .....	41
<i>Highland Crusader Offshore Partners L.P. v. Motient Corp.</i> , 281 S.W.3d 237 (Tex. App. – Dallas 2009, rev. denied) .....	20
<i>In re C.E.</i> , ___ S.W.3d ___, 2012 WL 4717882 (Tex. App. – Houston [1 <sup>st</sup> Dist.], October 4, 2012).....	17
<i>In re Does 1-10</i> , 242 S.W.3d 805 (Tex. App. – Texarkana 2007).....	31

<i>In re Gottheiner</i> , 703 F.2d 1136 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).....	22
<i>In re Marriage of Mason</i> , 46 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 1025 (Cal. Ct. App. 1996).....	23, 24, 25
<i>Inter-Cal Contract Carriers v. Boyd</i> , 2003 WL 58091 (Cal. Ct. App. 2003).....	21
<i>Jelinek v. Casas</i> , 328 S.W.3d 526 (Tex. 2010).....	37
<i>Jennings v. Wallbuilder Presentations, Inc.</i> , __ S.W.3d __, 2012 WL 3500715 (Tex. App. – Ft. Worth, Aug. 16, 2012).....	2
<i>Kastner v. Martin &amp; Drought, Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 260601 (Tex. App. – San Antonio 2009, rev. denied) (Not designated for publication).....	44
<i>Kinney v. Barnes</i> , Case No. 03-10-00657-CV, 2012 WL 5974092 (Tex. App. – Austin, November 21, 2012).....	12
<i>Lipsky v. Range Production Co.</i> , 2012 WL 3600014 (Tex. App. – Ft. Worth, August 23, 2012).....	2
<i>Live Oak Resort, Inc. Tex. Alcoholic Beverage Comm’n</i> , 920 S.W.2d 795 (Tex. App. – Houston [1 <sup>st</sup> Dist.] 1996).....	30, 31, 40
<i>MacGregor Med. Ass’n v. Campbell</i> , 985 S.W.2d 38 (Tex. 1998).....	44
<i>Mann v. Quality Old Time Serv., Inc.</i> , 120 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 90 (Cal. Ct. App. 2004).....	39
<i>Martinez v. The Welk Grp.</i> , __ F. Supp. 2d __, 2012 WL 5373415 (S.D. Cal., Oct. 30, 2012).....	42



<i>McCoy v. Dallas Area Rapid Transit</i> , 2011 WL 5864038 (Tex. App. – Dallas 2011) (Not designated for publication).....	44
<i>McDonald v. Clemens</i> , 464 S.W.2d 450 (Tex. App. – Tyler 1971).....	31
<i>Midland Pac. Bldg. Corp. v. King</i> , 157 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 264 (Cal. App. 2007, rev. denied).....	42
<i>Mission Consolidated Indep. School Dist. v. Garcia</i> , 372 S.W.3d 629 (Tex. 2012).....	31
<i>Mycogen Corp v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 28 Cal. 4 <sup>th</sup> 888 (Cal. 2002).....	25, 26
<i>Navellier v. Sletten</i> , 106 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 763 (Cal. Ct. App. 2003).....	21
<i>Newsom v. Brod</i> , 89 S.W.3d 732 (Tex. App. – Houston [1 <sup>st</sup> Dist.] 2002).....	43
<i>Oasis West Realty LLC v. Goldman</i> , 51 Cal. 4 <sup>th</sup> 811 (Cal. 2011).....	32
<i>Patent Scaffolding Co. v. William Simpson Constr. Co.</i> , 256 Cal. App. 2d 506 (Cal. Ct. App. 1967).....	42
<i>Pfeister v. Meltzer</i> , 2012 WL 407149 (Cal. Ct. App. 2012).....	21
<i>Piscitelli v. Friedenber</i> g, 87 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 953 (Cal. Ct. App. 2001).....	38
<i>Pitts &amp; Collard LLP v. Schechter</i> , 369 S.W.3d 301, 320 (Tex. App. – Houston [1 <sup>st</sup> Dist. 2011).....	17
<i>Quinn v. Nat’l Med. Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 2001 WL 767562 (Tex. App. – Dallas 2001) (Not designated for publication).....	44, 45

<i>Rodriguez v. I.B.M.</i> , 960 F. Supp. 227 (N.D. Cal. 1997).....	43
<i>Rudgayzer v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , __ F. Supp. 2d __, 2012 WL 5471149 (N.D. Cal., Nov. 9, 2012).....	42
<i>Ruiz v. Gap, Inc.</i> , 380 Fed. Appx. 689, 2010 WL 2170993 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010).....	42
<i>Sargon Enterprises, Inc. v. University of Southern Cal.</i> , __ P.3d __, 2012 WL 5897314 (Cal., November 26, 2012).....	37
<i>Silverado Modjeska Recreation and Parks Dist. v. County of Orange</i> , 197 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 282 (Cal. Ct. App. 2011) .....	22
<i>St. Paul Fire and Marine Ins. Co. v. American Dynasty Surplus Lines Ins. Co.</i> , 101 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 1038 (Cal. Ct. App. 2002) .....	42
<i>Summers v. McClanahan</i> , 2002 WL 1482576 (Cal. App. 2002).....	42
<i>Sutphin v. Speik</i> , 15 Cal. 2d 195 (Cal. 1940).....	24
<i>Swartzendruber v. City of San Diego</i> , 3 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 896 (Cal. Ct. App. 1992), <i>disapproved on other grounds, Johnson v. City of Loma Linda</i> , 24 Cal. 4 <sup>th</sup> 61 (Cal. 2000).....	29
<i>Takahashi v. Bd. of Ed.</i> , 202 Cal. App. 3d 1464 (Cal. Ct. App. 1988, rev. denied), <i>cert. denied</i> , 490 U.S. 1011 (1989) .....	26, 30
<i>Tex. Allergy, Asthma and Immunology Society v. United Biologics, LLC</i> , 2012 WL 5494282 (Tex. App. – Austin, November 08, 2012).....	2
<i>Tex. State Bd. of Dental Examiners v. Brown</i> , 281 S.W.3d 692 (Tex. App. – Corpus Christi 2009, rev. denied) .....	17

<i>Toyrrific, LLC v. Karapetian</i> , 2012 WL 5306229 (C.D. Cal. 2012) .....	42, 43
<i>TXI Transp. Co. v. Hughes</i> , 306 S.W.3d 230 (Tex. 2010) .....	35
<i>Unicon Fin. Serv., Inc. v. Intercept, Inc.</i> , 256 Fed. Appx. 27, 2007 WL 4165260 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007) .....	42
<i>Unity Pictures Corp. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i> , 2006 WL 1828336 (Cal. Ct. App. 2006) .....	21
<i>Vanderbilt Growth Fund, Inc. v. Superior Ct. of Los Angeles County</i> , 105 Cal. App. 3d 628 (Cal. Ct. App. 1980) .....	42
<i>Villacres v. ABM Indus. Inc.</i> , 189 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 562 (Cal Ct. App. 2010, rev. denied) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Walker v. Con Cap Equities, Inc.</i> , 2002 WL 971797 (Tex. App. – El Paso 2002) (Not designated for publication) .....	43
<i>Wiz Technology, Inc. v. Coopers &amp; Lybrand</i> , 106 Cal. App. 4 <sup>th</sup> 1 (Cal. Ct. App. 2003) .....	40
<i>Wright v. Fowler</i> , 991 S.W.2d 343 (Tex. App. – Ft. Worth 1999) .....	44
<i>Zero Motorcycles, Inc. v. Pirelli Tyre S.p.A.</i> , 802 F. Supp. 2d 1078 (N.D. Cal. 2011) .....	39
<i>1001 McKinney Ltd. v. Credit Suisse First Boston Mortgage Capital</i> , 192 S.W.3d 20 (Tex. App. – Houston [14 <sup>th</sup> Dist.] 2005, rev. denied) .....	30, 31
<b>Statutes and Rules</b>	
15 U.S.C. § 1051 .....	1
CAL. CIV. CODE § 33.01 .....	37

CAL. CIV. CODE § 3360.....	41
CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 425.16 .....	11
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 16.002.....	43
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 16.003.....	43
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 16.004.....	43
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001 .....	5, 19
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.002 .....	17
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.003 .....	1, 13, 18
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.004 .....	18
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.005 .....	<i>passim</i>
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.006 .....	19
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.008 .....	2
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.009 .....	1, 14
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.010 .....	19
TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.011 .....	19
TEX. R. APP. P. 34.5 .....	1

**Other Authorities**

H. Research Org. Bill Analysis, H.B. 2973, May 2, 2011 .....	19
S. Research Ctr. Bill Analysis, Tex. H.B. 2973, May 10, 2011 .....	17, 18

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Plaintiffs-Appellees and Cross-Appellants BCG Attorney Search, Inc. and Professional Authority, Inc. d/b/a Legal Authority sued Robert Kinney seeking damages for breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, and violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051 *et seq.* App. Tab 2 (CR 9-10).<sup>1</sup> Kinney moved to dismiss the case under TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.003(a). CR 12-54. The district court granted the motion as to plaintiffs' Lanham Act claim but denied it as to the contract and fiduciary duty claims. App. Tab 1 (SCR). The court also ordered BCG and Legal Authority to pay sanctions under § 27.009(a)(2) for bringing the claims to harass Kinney. *See id.*

The district court ruled on the motion by a rendition issued on July 3, 2012, and an amended rendition on July 5, 2012. CR 555-56, 565-67. The court then memorialized its ruling in an order issued on November 9, 2012. App. 1 (SCR). Kinney filed a notice of appeal following the rendition on August 31, 2012, CR 568-69, and a second notice of appeal following the order on December 13, 2012. (SCR). Both were filed within the statutorily prescribed sixty-day period following the rendition and order, respectively.

---

<sup>1</sup> "App." refers to the appendix attached to this brief. "CR \_\_\_" refers to the designated page in the clerk's record. "RR \_\_\_" refers to the designated page in the reporter's record. "SCR" refers to a supplemental clerk's record to be filed with this Court pursuant to Kinney's request under TEX. R. APP. P. 34.5(c).

See TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.008(c). BCG and Legal Authority have noticed a “conditional” cross-appeal of the portion of the order granting Kinney’s motion as to the Lanham Act claim and imposing sanctions.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE §§ 27.008(b) and (c) permit an accelerated interlocutory appeal of an order ruling on a motion to dismiss under § 27.003. However, one court has held that such an interlocutory appeal is limited to denials of such motions by operation of law under § 27.008(a). See *Jennings v. Wallbuilder Presentations, Inc.*, \_\_\_ S.W.3d \_\_\_, 2012 WL 3500715 (Tex. App. – Ft. Worth, Aug. 16, 2012). In this case, both parties agree that an interlocutory appeal may also be taken from an order affirmatively disposing of the motion. See CR 577-78 (Plaintiffs’ notice of cross-appeal). Moreover, the express text of §§ 27.008(b) and (c) acknowledges the permissibility of such appeals, which are also consistent with the statute’s purpose to facilitate early resolution of lawsuits targeting the exercise of free speech. This Court recently ordered briefing on appellate jurisdiction over interlocutory appeals under § 27.008 in another case. See *Tex. Allergy, Asthma and Immunology Society v. United Biologics, LLC*, 2012 WL 5494282 (Tex. App. – Austin, November 08, 2012). Kinney stands ready to brief the issue if the Court would find it useful. If, without additional briefing, the Court concludes it lacks jurisdiction over this appeal, it should treat the appeal as an application for a writ of mandamus. See *Lipsky v. Range Production Co.*, 2012 WL 3600014 (Tex. App. – Ft. Worth, August 23, 2012).

## **STATEMENT REGARDING ORAL ARGUMENT**

Kinney respectfully asks the Court to hear oral argument in this appeal. Because Texas's SLAPP statute is relatively new, there is a dearth of applicable case law to guide the court's decision. Moreover, the factual background of the case is relatively complex, involving a prior litigation in California adjudicating some of the matters at issue here. Thus, this case is not routine or simple, and the Court would benefit from the opportunity to explore the issues and sharpen the points of disagreement with counsel for the parties.

## ISSUES PRESENTED

1. Whether res judicata bars a suit based on a post on a consumer website when a previous case brought by the same plaintiffs based on the same post was dismissed on the merits, and the present claims could have been asserted in the first case.
2. Whether plaintiffs have satisfied Texas's rigorous SLAPP law by establishing by clear and specific evidence a prima facie case supporting their claim for damages when they have provided no proof that any decrease in business they experienced was caused by the online post.
3. Whether shorter statutes of limitations for libel and business disparagement bar claims styled as breach of contract and fiduciary duty when the nature of the conduct challenged in the suit is really libel and business disparagement, and plaintiffs have simply recast the claims to avoid a shorter limitations period.



## INTRODUCTION

This case is the third attempt by Harrison Barnes, owner of over 100 employment search companies including the plaintiffs, to sue his former employee Robert Kinney for a single unflattering statement Kinney posted on a consumer website over four years ago. Barnes sued Kinney in California over the post but lost that case and had to pay nearly \$45,000 in attorneys' fees to Kinney. He then instituted an arbitration against Kinney but discontinued it, choosing to file this case instead. He now admits that some of the negative things Kinney posted are true, but claims they divulged confidential information in violation of a purported employment contract. As in his unsuccessful California case, Barnes complains that the post harmed his companies' image and drove away potential clients.

In 2011, Texas followed the example of many other states and enacted a statute to combat what are called "strategic lawsuits against public participation," or "SLAPP." *See* TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 27.001, *et seq.* SLAPP laws protect the right of free speech by enabling citizens to obtain expedited dismissal of meritless lawsuits filed to punish them for speaking their minds. They exist precisely to prevent the sort of harassment exemplified by Barnes's latest suit against Kinney merely for expressing his personal opinions.