

United States District Court
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

LJH, LTD.	§	
	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 4:15-CV-00639
	§	Judge Mazzant
IRA J. JAFFE; and JAFFE, RAITT, HEUER	§	
& WEISS, P.C.	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is Defendants Ira J. Jaffe and Jaffe, Raitt, Heuer & Weiss, P.C.’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) (Dkt. #74). After reviewing the relevant pleadings, the Court determines the motion should be granted in part and denied in part.

BACKGROUND

This case concerns the sale and purchase of realty and equipment between LJH, Ltd. (“LJH”) and three entities, Go Frac, LLC (“Go Frac”), WRB Trucking Company, LLC, and GF Cambridge, LLC (collectively, the “Sellers”) (Dkt. #74 at p. 2). In July 2015, Ira Jaffe (“Jaffe”), acting on behalf of Jaffe, Raitt, Heuer & Weiss, P.C. (the “Jaffe Firm,” collectively with Jaffe, the “Jaffe Defendants”) made one or more telephone calls to Lacy Harber (“Harber”). Jaffe contacted Harber seeking to sell oil fracking equipment and real estate. The equipment and real estate that Jaffe and Harber discussed were owned by one or more entities of which Jaffe was “an owner and authorized representative” (Dkt. #73 at p. 9). Jaffe drafted contracts for the sale of the real estate and equipment, and Harber signed them. Harber, acting as representative for LJH, acquired an equitable lien on the real estate and equipment, advancing to the Sellers \$20,000,000 for the equipment and \$4,000,000 for the real estate. On or about July 27, 2015, Jaffe travelled to Grayson County, Texas, where he met with Harber and Harber’s accountant “to

negotiate new terms relating to the sale of the equipment and real property” (Dkt. #73 at p. 5). At this meeting, Jaffe disclosed issues related to the sale that caused LJH to back out of the deal.

On August 4, 2015, LJH filed its Original Petition in the 15th Judicial District Court of Grayson County, Texas, against the Jaffe Defendants, alleging a number of claims including fraud, negligent misrepresentation, conversion, conspiracy, and money had and received. LJH also seeks actual and punitive damages, and a constructive trust over the relinquished funds due to principles of unjust enrichment (Dkt. #3). On September 18, 2015, the Jaffe Defendants removed the case to this Court alleging diversity pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 and removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441 (Dkt. #1).

On July 28, 2016, the Court withdrew its previous order addressing Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2) and (6) (Dkt. #72). The Court allowed LJH to file a Second Amended Complaint to assert facts to overcome the Jaffe Defendants’ assertion of the attorney immunity doctrine. LJH filed its Second Amended Complaint on August 11, 2016 (Dkt. #73). On August 26, 2016, the Jaffe Defendants filed their Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Complaint (Dkt. #74). On September 12, 2016, LJH filed its response (Dkt. #75). On September 22, 2016, the Jaffe Defendants filed a reply (Dkt. #76). On October 3, 2016, LJH filed its sur-reply (Dkt. #77).

LEGAL STANDARD

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require that each claim in a complaint include a “short and plain statement . . . showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Each claim must include enough factual allegations “to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007).

A Rule 12(b)(6) motion allows a party to move for dismissal of an action when the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). When considering a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), the Court must accept as true all well-pleaded facts in plaintiff's complaint and view those facts in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Bowlby v. City of Aberdeen*, 681 F.3d 215, 219 (5th Cir. 2012). The Court may consider “the complaint, any documents attached to the complaint, and any documents attached to the motion to dismiss that are central to the claim and referenced by the complaint.” *Lone Star Fund V (U.S.), L.P. v. Barclays Bank PLC*, 594 F.3d 383, 387 (5th Cir. 2010). The Court must then determine whether the complaint states a claim for relief that is plausible on its face. “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the [C]ourt to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Gonzalez v. Kay*, 577 F.3d 600, 603 (5th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)). “But where the well-pleaded facts do not permit the [C]ourt to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged—but it has not ‘show[n]’—‘that the pleader is entitled to relief.’” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679 (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2)).

In *Iqbal*, the Supreme Court established a two-step approach for assessing the sufficiency of a complaint in the context of a Rule 12(b)(6) motion. First, the Court should identify and disregard conclusory allegations, for they are “not entitled to the assumption of truth.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 664. Second, the Court “consider[s] the factual allegations in [the complaint] to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief.” *Id.* “This standard ‘simply calls for enough facts to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence of the necessary claims or elements.’” *Morgan v. Hubert*, 335 F. App'x 466, 470 (5th Cir. 2009)

(citation omitted). This evaluation will “be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing [C]ourt to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679.

Thus, “[t]o survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Id.* at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570).

ANALYSIS

The Jaffe Defendants argue the conduct alleged by LJH in the Second Amended Complaint was made in the course of representing the Sellers in an asset sale transaction. As such, the Jaffe Defendants assert LJH’s claims should be dismissed based on the attorney immunity doctrine. LJH responds that Jaffe was not acting in his capacity as an attorney when he negotiated the terms of the “Equipment Purchase Agreement” with Harber. Specifically, LJH contends the July 10, 2015 Equipment Purchase Agreement listed Jaffe as an authorized representative for Go Frac and WRB Trucking Company, LLC and not as an attorney for those entities. Further, LJH maintains the Jaffe Firm is liable for ratifying Jaffe’s actions.

The attorney immunity doctrine provides that attorneys are “immune from civil liability to a non-client ‘for actions taken in connection with representing a client in litigation.’” *Cantey Hanger, LLP v. Byrd*, 467 S.W.3d 477, 481 (Tex. 2015) (quoting *Alpert v. Crain, Caton & James, P.C.*, 178 S.W.3d 398, 405 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2005, pet. denied)). “Even conduct that is ‘wrongful in the context of the underlying suit’ is not actionable if it is ‘part of the discharge of the [attorney’s] duties in representing his or her client’” and not “entirely foreign to the duties of an attorney.” *Id.* at 481–82 (citations omitted). The purpose of the doctrine is to allow attorneys broad latitude “to practice their profession, to advise their clients and interpose any defense or supposed defense, without making themselves liable for damages.”

Id. at 481 (quoting *Kruegel v. Murphy*, 126 S.W. 343, 345 (Tex. Civ. App.—Dallas 1910, writ ref’d)). Accordingly, providing immunity ensures “loyal, faithful, and aggressive representation by attorneys employed as advocates.” *Id.* (quoting *Mitchell v. Chapman*, 10 S.W.3d 810, 812 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2000, pet denied)). The dispositive question is whether the conduct was “the kind in which an attorney engages when discharging his duties to a client.” *Id.* at 482 (quoting *Dixon Fin. Servs., Ltd. v. Greenberg, Peden, Siegmyer & Oshman, P.C.*, No. 01-06-00696-CV, 2008 WL 746548, at *9 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2000, pet. denied)).

The Second Amended Complaint indicates the following facts the Court must accept as true and view in the light most favorable to LJH. *Bowlby*, 681 F.3d at 219. Harber and Jaffe communicated regarding the realty and equipment at issue (Dkt. #73 at p. 9). Jaffe was an “owner and authorized representative” of one or more of the entities that owned the equipment and realty (Dkt. #73 at p. 9). Harber signed three contracts based on the Jaffe Defendants’ representations and disclosures, and afterwards, at the request of Jaffe, sent a \$20,000,000 advance for the equipment and a \$4,000,000 advance for the realty, which were held in trust by the Jaffe Defendants (Dkt. #73 at pp. 3–4). On or about July 27, 2015, Jaffe flew to Grayson County, Texas, and met with Harber, and Harber’s accountant, Jim Keller, on behalf of LJH, to negotiate new terms relating to the sale (Dkt. #73 at p. 4). At this meeting, Jaffe disclosed issues to Harber, including: (1) he was an attorney; (2) he was a minor partner, with other individuals, in Go Frac; (3) Go Frac was insolvent; (4) Defendants needed to accelerate the closing date; (5) other claimants existed regarding the equipment LJH was to receive; (6) that future lawsuits could result from the sale and purchase; and (7) Jaffe and his law firm would represent Harber and/or LJH in a proceeding (Dkt. #73 at p. 5).

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.