Nadine Smith, Deputy

CAUSE NO.	Nadin
§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT
§	
§	
§	
§	OF POLK COUNTY, TEXAS
§	
§	
§	
LC §	411th
§	JUDICIAL DISTRICT

PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL PETITION

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW Plaintiff, Colton Lester, complaining of Defendants, Cecil Berg, Seth Johnson and Johnson Law Office, PLLC, and would respectfully show as follows:

I DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN

Based upon this Petition, this case should be controlled by a discovery control plan Level 2 pursuant to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 190.3. This is not an expedited action as Plaintiff has suffered and sustained pecuniary losses exceeding \$1,000,000.

II PARTIES

Plaintiff, Colton Lester is an individual residing in Polk County, Texas.

Defendant, Cecil Berg is lawyer residing and practicing law in Polk County, Texas and may be served at 1000 FM 365, Onalaska, Texas 77360.

Defendant, Seth Johnson is lawyer residing and practicing law in resident of Nacogdoches, Texas and may be served at 928 N. University, Nacogdoches, Texas 75961.

Defendant, Johnson Law Office, PLLC is a Professional Limited Liability Company formed for the practice of law in Texas. Johnson Law Office, PLLC may be served by serving its principal, Seth Johnson at 928 N. University, Nacogdoches, Texas 75961.

III JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the controversy because the claims asserted in this Petition arose, in whole or in part, in Texas and the amount in controversy exceeds the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court.

This Court has personal jurisdiction over each Defendant because the acts and/or omissions complained of herein occurred in Texas, each Defendant does and/or did do business in the State of Texas, has committed a tort, in whole or in part in Texas, is a resident and citizen of Texas, and/or has minimum contacts with the State of Texas during the period of time complained of herein.

Venue is properly laid in Polk County, Texas because at least one of the Defendants resides in, and/or has a principle office and headquarters in Polk County, Texas. *See* TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 15.002(a)(2),(3). Accordingly, venue is properly laid in Polk County, Texas.

IV FACTUAL BACKGROUND

This legal malpractice case arises out of the wrongful imprisonment of Plaintiff Colton Lester ("Lester") which resulted solely because of the gross negligence and incompetence of his counsel. On August 26, 2014, Lester, at 17 years old, was charged by Information for a criminal attempt to violate Section 33.021(b) of the Texas Penal Code, attempted solicitation of a minor. The alleged offense date was April 27, 2014. Lester had previously retained Defendant Seth Johnson ("Johnson"), a licensed attorney in the State of Texas, to represent him for the referenced charge. Johnson represented to Lester that he was a criminal law specialist and had investigated

the case and that Lester should make a plea bargain with the State. Johnson negotiated a plea bargain agreement that would place Lester on Deferred Adjudication Probation for a term of five years. On August 26, 2014, while represented in court by Johnson and at the recommendation of Johnson, Lester plead guilty to the offense of attempted online solicitation of a minor.

In 2016, A Motion to Revoke Lester's probation was filed. Defendant Cecil Berg, a licensed attorney in the State of Texas, represented Lester in the hearing to revoke Lester's probation and Lester was sentenced to three years in the Texas Department of Corrections.

In October of 2017, Lester was contacted by the State Counsel for Offenders who informed him for the first time that the statute under which he was convicted was void prior to the offense date. Specifically, on October 30, 2013, The Court of Criminal Appeals, *in Ex Parte Lo*, 424 S.W.3d 10 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013) held that Section 33.021(b) of the Texas Penal Code was unconstitutional. Therefore, A writ of Habeas Corpus was filed on Lester's behalf, and on April 11, 2018, The Court of Criminal Appeals vacated Lester's sentence in its entirety.

Unbelievably, and most egregiously, Defendants failed to disclose to Lester that the statute under which he was charged was void and non-existent. Thus, due to Defendants' negligence, gross negligence and breach of fiduciary duty, Lester lost his freedom at the tender age of 19 and was forced to endure almost two years of prison time for allegedly committing a crime that did not exist. Lester was thrown in prison at a time in his life when his friends and others his age were entering college and/or planning their future in the world. Needless to say, Lester has suffered severe emotional distress due to the gross misconduct of Defendants and lost time that can never be returned to him.

V STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

Therefore, it has become necessary to bring this suit to collect a legal debt of money damages owing to Plaintiff due to the Defendants' actions. The Defendants' actions constitute negligence, gross negligence and breach of fiduciary duty as those terms are understood in law.

A. NEGLIGENCE

Plaintiff incorporates those facts set forth above as if recited herein verbatim. In addition to the allegations outlined above, the following errors and/or omissions by Defendants in the underlying representation constitute negligence:

- Failure to protect Plaintiff's interest;
- Failure to diligently represent Plaintiff;
- Failure to address Plaintiff's rights and defenses;
- Failure to raise the issue that the statute under which Plaintiff was charged was void;
- Failure to protect Plaintiff's constitutional rights; and
- Failure to protect Plaintiff's freedom.

Of course, nothing Plaintiff did, or failed to do, caused or in any way contributed to cause the occurrences that resulted in losses and damages to Plaintiff. On the contrary, the Defendants fell below the standard of care for attorneys practicing law in Texas, and thus, Defendants' conduct was a proximate and/or producing cause of Plaintiff's losses and damages.

B. GROSS NEGLIGENCE

Plaintiff incorporates those facts set forth above as if recited herein verbatim. In addition to the allegations above, the following acts of malfeasance constitutes gross negligence. Defendants were grossly negligent because their acts or omissions in failing to raise the fact that Plaintiff was charged with a crime that did not exist. Thus, when viewed objectively from the

standpoint of Defendants at the time they were representing Plaintiff, their conduct involved an extreme degree of risk, considering the probability and magnitude of the potential harm to Plaintiff—the loss of his freedom. Defendants had actual, subjective awareness of the risk of Plaintiff being subjected to prison, but nevertheless proceeded with conscious indifference to the rights, safety, or welfare of Plaintiff. *See* TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 41.001(A) and (B). In fact, Plaintiff was subjected to prison due solely to Defendants' extreme malfeasance.

"The factor which 'lifts ordinary negligence into gross negligence is the mental attitude of the defendant. . . ." *Rhodes v. Batilla*, 848 S.W.2d 833, 844 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, writ denied). When a lawyer, through their omissions, acts in direct contravention to the purpose for which they were retained and with an extreme degree of risk to their client, they can be held grossly negligent. *See Id.* Defendants' utter lack of care as to Plaintiff's underlying case and blind ignorance of the law is the factor which lifts their conduct from ordinary negligence to gross negligence. *See Id.* Thus, they are liable for exemplary damages and mental anguish caused to Plaintiff. *See Id.* (upholding award to client in legal malpractice case for \$125,000 in actual damages and \$125,000 in exemplary damages).

C. Breach of Fiduciary Duty

At all times material, Defendants owed Plaintiff various fiduciary duties as a matter of law, including, among others:

- Duty of loyalty and utmost good faith;
- Duty of candor;
- Duty of confidentiality;
- Duty to refrain from self-dealing;
- Duty to act with integrity of the strictest kind;

- Duty of fair, honest dealing;
- Duty of full disclosure all material facts;
- Duty to represent Plaintiff with undivided loyalty; and
- Duty to act with absolute perfect candor, openness, honesty, and without any concealment or deception.

Defendants intentionally breached one or more of the above fiduciary duties by concealing from Plaintiff that the statute he was charged under had been abolished. Defendants concealed this fact so that they could extract more attorney's fees from Lester rather than having the charges brought against him immediately thrown out. Defendants did this to place their own interests ahead of Plaintiff. Defendants further breached their fiduciary duties to Plaintiff by not disclosing their malfeasance to Plaintiff. These breaches of fiduciary duty proximately caused Plaintiff damages in that, had Defendants not placed their interests ahead of Plaintiff's, Plaintiff would have never been sent to prison for almost two years and would not have been forced to endure the emotional trauma that comes to serving almost two years in prison for a crime that does not exist.

VI DISCOVERY & TOLLING RULE

To the extent necessary, Plaintiff affirmatively pleads the discovery rule and/or the *Hughes* tolling rule to any defense of limitations asserted by Defendants regarding any of Plaintiff's causes of action.

VII DAMAGES

Regarding the causes of action and conduct alleged above, Plaintiff has sustained pecuniary losses that were proximately caused by Defendants' conduct. Plaintiff hereby seeks the maximum allowable of actual damages that are within the jurisdictional limits of this court and Plaintiff seeks monetary relief in excess of \$1,000,000.

A. ACTUAL DAMAGES

Plaintiff seeks actual damages in an amount in excess of \$1,000,000.

B. EXEMPLARY DAMAGES

Due to Defendants' gross negligence and breach of fiduciary duty, Plaintiff is entitled to exemplary damages which he seeks herein. Plaintiff seeks exemplary damages to the maximum extent of the law.

C. EMOTIONAL DISTRESS DAMAGES

Plaintiff is entitled to emotional distress damages due to Defendants' malfeasance and hereby seeks such damages to the maximum extent of the law.

D. FEE FORFEITURE

The Court may order all fees obtained by a fiduciary to be disgorged as a result of the breach of fiduciary duty when the fiduciary breaches a fiduciary duty. Thus, Plaintiff seeks to disgorge all of the fees paid to Defendants.

VIII JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff desires to have a jury decide this case and makes this formal request pursuant to Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 216. This request is filed more than thirty days before this case has been scheduled for trial and all fees have been paid.

IX REQUEST FOR DISCLOSURE

Under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 194, Plaintiff requests that Defendants disclose, within 50 days of the service of this request, the information or material described in Rule 194.2.

X PRAYER

THEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that after trial herein, that judgment be entered against Defendants jointly and severally as prayed for, that costs of court be taxed against Defendants, that Plaintiff be given prejudgment as well as post judgment interest, and for such other and further relief, at law and in equity to which Plaintiff may show himself to be justly entitled, to which the Court believes Plaintiff to be deserving, and for which Plaintiff will ever pray.

Respectfully submitted,

THE KASSAB LAW FIRM

/ s / Lance Christopher Kassab LANCE CHRISTOPHER KASSAB Texas State Bar No. 00794070 lance@kassab.law DAVID ERIC KASSAB Texas State Bar No. 24071351 david@kassab.law 1214 Elgin Street Houston, Texas 77004 Telephone: 713-522-7400

Telephone: 713-522-7400 Facsimile: 713-522-7410

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

Filed 8/2/2018 3:33 PM Bobbye Richards District Clerk Polk County, Texas

Nadine Smith, Deputy

CIVIL CASE INFORMATION SHEET

CAUSE NUMBER (FOR	lton of	este	ce Co; In re	Mary Ann Jones; in the	12	PR CLERK US	of	Nadine Smith	
health case or when a post-judge filing. This sheet, approved by t	ust be completed and ment motion for modif the Texas Judicial Co- ice of pleading or other	submitted whication or enfuncil, is inter	en an origiorcement	inal petition or applic is filed in a family lav llect information that	cation is fil w case. The will be us	ed to initiate e information sed for statis	a new civ should b tical purp	ril, family law, probate, or mental the the best available at the time of oses only. It neither replaces nor a discovery request, response, or	
1. Contact information for pers	on completing case in	formation sk	reet:	Names of parties in	case:		Person	or entity completing sheet is:	
0	/		$\overline{}$				Attorn	ey for Plaintiff/Petitioner	
Name: Kassab Kassable				Plaintiff(s)/Petitioner(s) Of the See Plaintif Title IV-D Ag Other:					
Address: Telephone: 7135227400					Additional Parties in Child Support Case:				
City/State/Zip: Fax: Defendant(s)/Respo						ndent(s): Custodial Parent:			
How by 7/7004 7135227410 Cearl Dorg Non-Custodial Parent:								todial Parent:	
Signature:	State Bar No:	00794	070	Langue		off	Presidence	PULC .	
2 ano	22/1	1440 7	79	Attach additional page as n	eccssary to lis	t all parties}	1103411104	i i dulci,	
2. Indicate case type, or identify	the most important	sens in the c	gen feelam				***********		
2. Indicate case type, or identity	Civil	issue in the C	ase (Select	only 1).	T		Fam	ily Law	
		= 1-1-2-7-1-1						Post-judgment Actions	
Contract Debt/Contract	Injury or Da	nage		Real Property	Action .	riage Relatio	nship	(non-Title IV-D)	
Consumer/DTPA	Assault/Battery Construction		Eminent Domain/ Condemnation		_	nulment clare Marriag	na Waid	Enforcement Modification—Custody	
Debt/Contract	Defamation		Parti		Divor		ic void	Modification—Other	
Fraud/Misrepresentation	Malpractice		Quie	t Title		With Childre	n i	Title IV-D	
Other Debt/Contract:	Accounting			pass to Try Title		No Children		Enforcement/Modification	
Foreclosure	Legal		Othe	er Property:				Paternity	
Home Equity—Expedited	Medical Other Profession	mal	-		1			Reciprocals (UIFSA)	
Other Foreclosure	Liability:	A FOIT						Support Order	
Franchise			Rel	ated to Criminal	0	Alexander Manager Control		Parat Child Daladanah	
Insurance	Motor Vehicle Ad	cident	Frm	Matters		Other Family Law Enforce Foreign		Parent-Child Relationship Adoption/Adoption with	
Landlord/Tenant	Premises Product Liability			ment Nisi		dgment	·	Termination	
Non-Competition Partnership	Asbestos/Silica			-Disclosure		beas Corpus		Child Protection	
Other Contract:	Other Product I	iability	Seizure/Forfeiture		(Common or other party of the common of the	me Change		Child Support	
	List Product:			The state of the s		Protective Order		Custody or Visitation	
	Pre-indictme					moval of Dis	abilities	Gestational Parenting	
	Other Injury or D	d	of Minority Grandparent Access Other: Parentage/Paternity						
					_			Termination of Parental	
Employment	armed	Other	Laboration .		-			Rights	
Discrimination Retaliation	Administrative A	appeal		yer Discipline etuate Testimony	1			Other Parent-Child:	
Termination	Competition			rities/Stock	1				
Workers' Compensation	Code Violations		-	ious Interference	1				
Other Employment:	Foreign Judgmen		Othe	ar:					
**************************************	Intellectual Prop	erty							
Tax	Probate & Mental Health								
Tax Appraisal	Probate/Wills/Intes	tate Administr	ration	1700ate Q 19		ship—Adult			
Tax Delinquency	Dependent A			Ī	GuardianshipMinor				
Other Tax				Mental Health					
	Other Estate I	roceedings		E	Other:				
3. Indicate procedure or remedy, if applicable (may select more than 1):									
Appeal from Municipal or Just			ory Judgn	nent		Preiudo	ment Ren	nedy	
Arbitration-related			Garnishment		Protective Order				
			Interpleader			Receiver			
Bill of Review					Sequest				
Certiorari Mandamus Class Action Post-judgment						Turnov		nining Order/Injunction	
LICIOSS ACTIVII		rost-jud	Ellight.			I UTTOV	CI		