

Notice of Service of Process

A3M / ALL Transmittal Number: 21971452 Date Processed: 09/02/2020

Primary Contact: Lisa Schomaker

AGCO Corporation 4205 River Green Pkwy Duluth, GA 30096-2563

Electronic copy provided to: Joe Lewinski

Lynnette Schoenfeld

Entity: AGCO Corporation

Entity ID Number 3993163

Entity Served: AGCO Corp

Title of Action: Holt Texas, Ltd vs. AGCO Corp

Document(s) Type: Citation/Petition

Nature of Action: Violation of State/Federal Act

Court/Agency: Bexar County District Court, TX

Case/Reference No: 2020CI15823

Jurisdiction Served: Texas

Date Served on CSC: 08/31/2020

Answer or Appearance Due: 10:00 am Monday next following the expiration of 20 days after service

Originally Served On: CSC

How Served: Personal Service
Sender Information: G Wade Caldwell
210-225-1655

Information contained on this transmittal form is for record keeping, notification and forwarding the attached document(s). It does not constitute a legal opinion. The recipient is responsible for interpreting the documents and taking appropriate action.

To avoid potential delay, please do not send your response to CSC

251 Little Falls Drive, Wilmington, Delaware 19808-1674 (888) 690-2882 | sop@cscglobal.com



Case 5:20-cv-01112 Document 1-3 Filed 09/17/20 Page 2 of 24

Case Number: 2020-CI-15823

2020CI15823 S00001

HOLT TEXAS LTD

VS.

AGCO CORP

(Note: Attached Document May Contain Additional Litigants.)

IN THE DISTRICT COURT 225th JUDICIAL DISTRICT BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS .

CITATION

"THE STATE OF TEXAS"

Directed To: AGCO CORP

BY SERVING ITS REGISTERED AGENT CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANON

DBA CSC-LAWYERS INCORPORATING SERVICE COMPANY

Patrick A Dennis PSC-13727 2/28/2022 -31 - 2020

:00

These documents delivered by:

"You have been sued. You may employ an attorney, if you or your attorney do not file a written answer with the clerk who issued this citation by 10:00 a.m. on the Monday next following the expiration of twenty days after you were served this CITATION and ORIGINAL PETITION AND MOTION FOR REFERRAL TO PRIVATE ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO CONTRACT, a default judgment may be taken against you." Said ORIGINAL PETITION AND MOTION FOR REFERRAL TO PRIVATE ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO CONTRACT was filed on the 20th day of August, 2020.

ISSUED UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF SAID COURT ON THIS 26TH DAY OF AUGUST A.D., 2020.

ZACHARY J FANUCCHI ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF 700 N SAINT MARYS ST 1825 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78205-3507



Mary Angie Garcia Bexar County District Clerk 101 W. Nueva, Suite 217 San Antonio, Texas 78205

By: Alexandra Johnson, Deputy

VS AGCO CORP	Officer's Return	Court: 225th Judicial District Court	
I received this CITATION on at at at at at at or () not executed to at at or () not executed to at at or () not executed to at	PURSUANT TO CONTRACT the date in person on the	of delivery endorsed on it to the defendant,	
Fees:Badge/PPS #:Date ce OR: VERIFICATION OF RETURN (If not served by a peace	Ву:	County, Texas	
OR: My name is	, my date of birth is	NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF TEXAS	
I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing the day of, 20	County.		



FILED 8/20/2020 12:58 PM Mary Angie Garcia Bexar County District Clerk Accepted By: Maria Jackson

aria Jackson	CAUSE NO.	2020CI158	23	8/20
HOLT TEXAS, LTD., Plaintiff,		§ 8	IN THE DISTRIC	T COURT
v.		§ 2251	th JUDICIAL	DISTRICT
AGCO CORP., Defendant.		5 §	BEXAR COUNT	Y, TEXAS

at mas

PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL PETITION AND MOTION FOR REFERRAL TO PRIVATE ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO CONTRACT

COMES NOW HOLT TEXAS, LTD. ("Holt"), pursuant to Chapter 57 of the Texas Business & Commerce Code, complaining of AGCO CORP. ("Agco"), Defendant, and for cause of action would respectfully show as follows:

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 1. This is a suit to compel payment for the return of a dealer's inventory of parts and other items after the termination of a dealership agreement pursuant to Chapter 57 of the Texas Bus. & Comm. Code. Plaintiff also moves for an Order by the Court to refer this matter to private arbitration in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas.
- 2. This case involves claims for monetary relief over \$200,000.00 but not more than \$1,000,000.00.

II. DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN

3. Discovery will be conducted under Level 3 under Rule 190.4, Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

III. PARTIES

4. Plaintiff is a Texas limited partnership doing business in North and South Texas and headquartered in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas.



5. Defendant, AGCO CORP., is a Georgia corporation duly qualified to do business in the State of Texas which may be served with citation by and through its registered agent for service of process, Corporation Service Company d/b/a CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service Company, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, Texas, 78701-3136.

IV. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY

- 6. The Court has jurisdiction over the claims brought by Plaintiff herein, as the amount in controversy exceeds the minimum jurisdictional limit of this Court. The Court also has jurisdiction over the foreign Defendant because it contracted to do business in Texas, actively does business in Texas, and has purposefully availed itself to the Jurisdiction of this Court.
- 7. Venue in Bexar County, Texas is appropriate because the terminated dealership agreement was performable in Texas. Pleading further, Plaintiff will show venue in Bexar County, Texas, is appropriate pursuant to § 57.051 of the Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code in that Plaintiff is headquartered in Bexar County, Texas.

V. BACKGROUND

- 8. Since at least 2014, Plaintiff and Defendants were parties to multiple Dealer Sales and Service Agreements whereby Defendant agreed to consider Plaintiff a retail dealer for the purchase, retail sale and after-sale servicing of Defendant's products. By way of example, a true and correct copy of Plaintiff's 2014 contract with Defendant for Plaintiff's Corpus Christi location is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.
- 9. In Fall 2019, Plaintiff elected to terminate its dealership association with Defendant, as provided by the parties' contract. Plaintiff gave notice to Defendant of its intention to terminate the parties' contracts, pursuant to Chapter 57 of the Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code and paragraph 51 of the parties' agreement.



- 10. On November 4, 2019 Plaintiff returned the first of several batches of parts from multiple locations to Defendant, pursuant to Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code Chapter 57 and received credit for the return of those parts in late January or February 2020 in the amount of \$983,784.00.
- 11. Plaintiff returned a second batch of parts, again from multiple locations, in late April 2020 and received credit for the return of those parts in the amount of \$205,987.00 in July of 2020. However, despite several requests by Holt to make one final return of unsold parts to Defendant, purchased for 12 of its stores in north and south Texas (the "Remaining Parts") for which Plaintiff paid \$264,415.10, Defendant has failed and refused to agree to accept the return of these parts. Plaintiff estimates it is entitled to reimbursement in the amount of \$290,856.61 for these Remaining Parts pursuant to. Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code §§ 57.353 and 57.355.
- 12. The parties' agreement calls for any dispute concerning the dealership agreements to be referred to private arbitration and conducted pursuant to the rules of the American Arbitration Association. In addition to the other relief requested herein, Plaintiff seeks entry of an order referring this case to private arbitration in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas.

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF TEX. BUS. & COMM. CODE § 57

- 13. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations of paragraph 9-12 into this paragraph 13 the same as if fully set forth.
- 14. Defendant's refusal to pay or credit Plaintiff's account for the value of the Remaining Parts is a violation of Plaintiff's rights under TEX. BUS. & COMM. CODE §§ 57.353 and 355, which provides for the recovery of 110% of the cost of the parts upon a finding of liability. Plaintiff also seeks pre- and post-judgment interest.
- 15. As a result of Defendant's refusal to pay, Plaintiff has been harmed in the amount of at least \$290,856.61, for which Plaintiff now sues. Plaintiff also seeks the recovery of reasonable



DOCKET

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.

