

Creditor Causes of Action

Mark P. Blenden
David W. Roth
The Blenden Roth Law Firm
P.O. Box 560326
Dallas, TX 75356
888-799-3000
mark@blendenlawfirm.com
david@blendenlawfirm.com

Copyright 2010; all rights
reserved except as to forms.

The University of Texas School of Law
Mastering The Art of Collecting Debts and Judgments
Austin, September 2-3, 2010

THE BLENDEEN ROTH LAW FIRM

Mark P. Blenden received his Juris Doctor degree with honors from Washburn Law School of Topeka, Kansas in 1973. After four years in the United States Air Force - Judge Advocate General Corp., he joined Houston's Lapin, Totz and Mayer law firm, becoming a partner and the senior litigator in the commercial collection section. In 1987 he founded the Blenden Law Firm in Dallas. The firm's practice is primarily commercial collection, commercial litigation, and collection of judgments.

Mr. Blenden is a frequent author and lecturer for seminars sponsored by the State Bar of Texas and University of Houston Law Foundation. Topics include service of process and default judgments; creditor's claims; trial techniques. Mr. Blenden is a former chairman of the state bar's Advanced Creditor's Rights Course. He was appointed by the Texas Supreme Court to the Process Service Review Board.

David W. Roth received his Doctor of Jurisprudence from the University of Houston Law Center in December, 2002. Prior to joining the Blenden Law Firm, Mr. Roth interned for the Texas First District Court of Appeals and ExxonMobil Chemical Company. Mr. Roth joined the Blenden Law Firm as an associate attorney in 2003. Mr. Roth lectured at several University of Houston Law Foundation seminars, including *Collecting Debts & Judgments* and *Advising Businesses in a Troubled Economy*. He is a current member and past president of Southlake Toastmasters.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

CAUSES OF ACTION:

Rule 185 (Sworn Account)	1
Account Stated	15
Quantum Meruit	19
Money Had and Received	22
Promissory Note	25
Guaranty	36

TRIAL TECHNIQUES:

Business Records Affidavit	10
Services Affidavit	10
Payment	11

APPENDICES:

Sworn Account Suit Affidavit	Appendix A
Form Discovery (Sworn Account)	Appendix B
Form Discovery (Guaranty)	Appendix C

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE: SWORN ACCOUNTS	1
I. Rule 185	1
A. Broad Rule	1
B. Allows Judgment on the Pleadings	1
C. Fallacies As to Scope and Required Specificity of Rule 185 Sworn Account	2
1. Fallacy One: That Sale of Personal Property is Required.	2
2. Sale of Personal Property is Not Required; Cases	3
a. Generally	3
b. Texas Supreme Court Cases	3
c. Insurance Premiums	3
d. Electrical Utility Service	4
e. Freight Services	4
f. Telephone Services	4
g. Mailing Services	4
h. Staffing Services	4
i. Advertising	4
j. Attorney’s Fees	4
k. Equipment Repairs	4
l. Personal Property Lease	5
m. Credit Cards - - Conflicting Cases	5
3. Fallacy Two: Sworn Account Requires Specific Account Description	5
4. 1984 Amendment to Rule 185 Negating Specificity	5
5. Troublesome Cases Ignoring “No Particularization” Amendment	6
II. Pleadings	6
A. Petition	6
B. The Affidavit	7
C. Attachments to Petition (Caution)	7
D. The Answer	8
1. Requirements of Sworn Denial	8
2. Affirmative Defenses - - Allowed Without Sworn Denial	8
III. Elements	9
A. Generally	9
B. Order as Additional Element	9
C. Price	9
D. Amount Due	10
IV. Proof	10
A. Business Records Affidavit	10

B. Services Affidavit	10
C. Discovery with Petition	11
V. Defenses	11
A. Negating Elements	11
B. Stranger to the Transaction	11
C. Payment	11
VI. Motions for Summary Judgment	12
A. Generally	12
B. Specificity of Motion	12
C. Obtain Ruling on Objections	13
D. Affidavit As Summary Judgment Evidence	13
1. Personal Knowledge Requirement	13
2. Readily Controverted Requirement	13
3. Avoid Conclusory Statement	14
E. Other Summary Judgment Cases	14
PART TWO: ACCOUNT STATED	15
I. Definition of Account Stated	15
II. Elements	15
III. Pleading	15
IV. Proof	16
V. Defenses	18
A. Attack Elements	18
B. The “Forgotten Offset”	18
PART THREE: UNJUST ENRICHMENT CLAIMS	19
I. Quantum Meruit	19
A. Definition and Elements	19
B. Expectation of Payment or Deal as Element	20
C. Reasonable Notification To the Person Sought To be Charged	20
D. Other Restrictions	20
E. Limitations	21
F. Attorney’s Fees	22

II	Money Had and Received	22
	A. Definition and Elements	22
	B. Pleading	22
	C. Cases	23
	1. Improper Fees	23
	2. Transferred Assets	23
	3. Retained Money, Realty	23
	4. Retained Money, Goods	23
	5. Escrowed Funds	23
	6. Expert's Services	23
	7. Remodeling Services	23
	8. Legal Services	23
	9. Wrongful Credit Card Charges	23
	10. Child Support Overpayment	24
	11. Misapplication of Mortgage Payment	24
	12. Not Bank Account; Failure to Prove Control	24
	13. Not Improper Payment of Check	24
	14. Not Defective Product Claim	24
	15. Not Freight Overcharges Where Contract Controlled	24
	D. Attorney's Fees	24
	E. Limitations	24
	PART FOUR: PROMISSORY NOTE	25
I.	Definitions and Terms	25
	A. Promissory Note	25
	B. Maker	25
	C. Holder	25
	D. Bearer	25
II.	Elements of Suit on Note	25
III.	Pleadings	25
	A. Petition	25
	1. Promissory Note As A Sworn Account Claim	26
	2. Conditions Precedent (Rule 54)	26
	B. Answer	26
	1. General Denial	26
	2. Denial of Signature	26
	3. Payment	27
	4. Conditions Precedent	27
IV.	Evidentiary Issues	27

A.	Summary Judgment	27
B.	Proof of the Note	27
C.	Proof of Ownership	28
D.	Lost Note	28
E.	Proof of the Balance Due	29
F.	Variable Interest Rates	29
V.	Acceleration & Notice	30
A.	Generally	30
B.	Presentment	30
C.	Notice of Intent to Accelerate	30
D.	Notice of Acceleration	31
E.	Waiver	31
VI.	Defenses	31
A.	Limitations	31
B.	Payment	32
C.	Agency	32
D.	Fraud in the Inducement	34
1.	Generally	34
2.	Cases Holding No Fraud in the Inducement	34
3.	Cases Holding Fraud in the Inducement	34
E.	Release	35
	PART FIVE: GUARANTY	36
I.	Strict Construction	36
A.	Contra to Strict Construction	36
II.	Guaranty of Payment Versus Collection	37
III.	Continuing Versus Specific Guaranty	37
IV.	Pleading	37
A.	Petition	37
B.	Answer	38
V.	Elements	38
A.	Generally	38
B.	Prove Underlying Debt; Performance by Holder	38
C.	Consideration	38

- VI. Defenses 39
 - A. Guarantor’s Assertion of Obligor’s Defenses 39
 - B. Statute of Frauds 39
 - C. Change of Obligor 39
 - D. Agency Signature 39
 - E. Enhancement of Risk (Material Alteration) 40
 - F. Limitations 40
 - G. Payment 41
 - H. Release 41

- VII. Other Guaranty Matters 41
 - A. Waiver 41
 - B. Contribution 41

- PART SIX: OTHER MATTERS 42**

- I. Cases 42
 - A. Attorney’s Fees 42
 - B. Discovery Responses in Defendant’s Answer 42

- II. Statutes 42
 - A. Justice Court Jurisdiction 42
 - B. Pleadings Must Contain Partial Identification Information 42
 - C. Provision of Current Address of Party in Civil Action 43
 - D. Signing of Pleadings - Further Address Requirement 43

POP QUIZ

- 1) Probably the most difficult defense to plead. Defendant must “file with his plea an account.” What is the defense? _____
- 2) Plaintiff serves affidavit as to the amount and necessity of attorney services, and attaches detailed invoices. What must Defendant do to contest fees? _____
- 3) Creditor sues Debtor and Guarantor on sworn account and guaranty. Debtor defaults. At trial against Guarantor, what must Creditor prove? _____
- 4) (True or False) A creditor threatened with a usury claim should consider curing the alleged usury violation.

Answers:

- 1) Payment, Rule 95. See this article, page 11.
- 2) Promptly file and serve counter-affidavit. Otherwise, plaintiff’s affidavit is incontrovertible. Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code, § 18.001, Affidavit Concerning Cost & Necessity of Services; See page 10.
- 3) The Guaranty, Guarantor’s signature, and the underlying account (order, delivery, reasonable/ agreed price, and balance due). See *Daredia v. Nat’l Distributions*, No. 05-04-00307-CV (Tex. App.–Dallas, April 28, 2005, pet. denied)(2005 Tex. App. Lexis 3168)(mem. op.). Reversed and rendered. See page 38.
- 4) TRUE. See Tex. Fin. Code §305.006(c)(pre-suit cure, correct the violation), §305.006(d)(post-suit cure, correct violation and pay obligor’s reasonable attorney’s fees as determined by court), and creditor’s waiver of cure opportunity in *Walker & Assocs. Surveying v. Roberts*, 306 S.W.3d 839, 853(Tex. App–Texarkana 2010, n.p.h.).

PART ONE:

SWORN ACCOUNTS

“Counsel should be aware that there is considerable confusion as to the scope of the sworn account rule.” 1-11 Dorsaneo, Tex. Litigation Guide § 11.52.

I. RULE 185

A. Broad Rule

Rule 185, Suit On Account states:

When any action or defense is founded upon an open account or other claim for goods wares and merchandise, **including any claim for a liquidated money demand based upon written contract or founded on business dealings between the parties**, or is for personal service rendered, or labor done or labor or materials furnished, **on which a systematic record has been kept**, and is supported by the affidavit of the party, his agent or attorney taken before some officer authorized to administer oaths, to the effect that such claim is, within the knowledge of affiant, just and true, that it is due, and that all just and lawful offsets, payments and credits have been allowed, the same shall be taken as prima facie evidence thereof, unless the party resisting such claim shall file a written denial, under oath. A party resisting such a sworn claim shall comply with the rules of pleading as are required in any other kind of suit, provided, however, that if he does not timely file a written denial, under oath, he shall not be permitted to deny the claim, or any item therein, as the case may be. **No particularization or description of the nature of the component parts of the account or claim is necessary unless the trial court sustains special exceptions to the pleadings.**

(emphasis added)

Note the breadth of the rule, as it includes a claim for a liquidated money demand founded on business dealings between the parties on which a systematic record has been kept. What debt is not within this expansive category?

B. Allows Judgment on the Pleadings

Sworn account is a creditor’s preferred cause of action. The rule has numerous advantages. Absent a sworn denial, a proper sworn account is self proving and entitles creditor to judgment on the pleadings: *Airborne Freight Corp. v. CRB Mktg, Inc.*, 566 S.W.2d 573, 574 (Tex. 1978)(trial); *Wilson v. Browning Arms Co.*, 501 S.W. 2d 705, 706 (Tex. Civ. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1973 writ ref’d.)(summary judgment); *O’Brian v. Cole*, 532 S.W.2d 151, 152 (Tex. Civ. App.–Dallas 1976, no writ)(default judgment; sworn account is liquidated claim requiring no further proof of damages). A defendant who does not file a sworn denial to a properly filed suit on sworn account cannot

Sworn Account

dispute the accuracy of the stated charges. See Rule 93(10), and Rule 185; *Vance v. Holloway*, 689 S.W.2d 403, 404, 28 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 343 (Tex. 1985); *Huddleston v. Case Power & Equip. Co.* 748 S.W.2d 102, 103 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1988, no writ). It is a rare creditor's case that should not be pleaded, at least alternatively, as a sworn account. But sworn accounts are the subject of some questionable appellate decisions and fallacies.

C. Fallacies As to Scope and Required Specificity of Rule 185 Sworn Account

1. Fallacy One: That Sale of Personal Property is Required (The Meaders v. Biskamp problem).

Numerous cases purport to require the sale of personal property to constitute a sworn account. These cases generally rely on cases in which the issue is whether the transaction is a sworn account within former Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. Ann. art. 2226. Article 2226 was the predecessor to Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. Chapter 38 and allowed recovery of attorney fees for sworn accounts. But Article 2226 was deemed penal in nature and strictly construed. See, e.g., *Meaders v. Biskamp*, 316 S.W.2d 75,78 (Tex.1958) (sworn account under Article 2226 requires sale and transfer of title to personal property; Article 2226 is penal in nature and strictly construed; contract to drill well not Article 2226 sworn account); *Van Zandt v. Ft. Worth Press*, 359 S.W.2d 893, 895 (Tex.1962)(citing *Meaders*, requires passage of title to personal property to be sworn account within Article 2226); *Langdeau v. Bouknight*, 344 S.W.2d 435, 441 (Tex. 1961) (citing *Meaders*, an Article 2226 sworn account does not include special contracts).

Unfortunately, some courts blindly follow these cases even when attorney fees are not the issue. See *Williams v. Unifund CCR Partners*, No. 01-06-00927-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.], February 7, 2008, no pet. (2008 Tex. App. Lexis 931)(credit card debt not basis of sworn account because no title to personal property transferred, citing *Meaders*, supra); *Resurgence Fin, L.L.C. v. Lawrence*, No. 01-08-00341-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.], October 8, 2009, n.p.h.)(2009 Tex. App. LEXIS 7927)(mem. op.)(same); *Tully v. Citibank, N.A.*, 173 S.W.3d 212, 216 (Tex. App.–Texarkana 2005, no pet.)(same); *Hou-Tex Printers v. Marbach*, 862 S.W.2d 188, 190 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1993) (promissory note is not basis of sworn account because there is no passage of title to personal property, citing *Meaders*); *Superior Derrick Servs. v. Anderson*, 831 S.W.2d 868, 873 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1992, writ denied); *Young v. Am. Express Co.*, No. 06-01-00035-CV (Tex.App.–Texarkana, October 26, 2001, no pet.)(unpublished, 2001 Tex. App. Lexis 7217)(credit card account not basis of sworn account because no title to personal property is transferred); *EMCC, Inc. v. Johnson*, No. 10-05-00287-CV (Tex. App.–Waco, October 25, 2006, no pet.)(2006 Tex. App. Lexis 9277)(mem. op.)(same).

The fallacy of requiring passage of title to personal property is noted by Justice Mirabel in an excellent concurring opinion in which she discusses a line of cases traced back to *Meaders*. Justice Mirabel notes the breadth of Rule 185, which includes cases in which title to property does not pass. *Schorer v. Box Service Co.*, 927 S.W.2d 132 (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] 1997, writ denied). See *Seisdata, Inc. v. Compagnie Generale de Geophysique*, 598 S.W.2d 690, 691 (Tex. Civ. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1980, writ ref'd n.r.e.)(sworn account includes services; properly

Sworn Account

distinguishes Meaders as an attorney's fee case).

2. Sale of Personal Property is Not Required; Cases

a. Generally

The clear language of Rule 185 makes it applicable to “personal service rendered”, “labor done”, “labor or material furnished,” and that sweeping category, “business dealings between the parties.” Countless cases recognize that sale of personal property is not required for a Rule 185 sworn account. *Griswold v. Carlson*, 249 S.W.2d 58 (Tex. 1952)(assumes without holding, that money owed as a result of fraud and deceit is sworn account; issue was sufficiency of sworn account affidavit); *Novosad v. Cunningham*, 38 S.W.3d 767 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.], 2001, no pet.)(accounting services); *Nat'l W. Life Ins. Co. v. Acreman*, 425 S.W.2d 815 (Tex. 1968)(labor and materials to build road); *Willie v. Donovan & Watkins, Inc.*, No.01-00-01039-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.], April 11, 2002, no pet.)(unpublished, 2002 Tex. App. Lexis 2655) (employment agency fees); *Boodhwani v. Bartosh*, No. 03-02-0432-CV(Tex. App.–Austin, March 6, 2003, no pet.)(unpublished, 2003 Tex. App. Lexis 1907)(dental services).

b. Texas Supreme Court Cases

The Texas Supreme Court ruled on the following sworn account claims without requiring passage of title to personal property:

Griswold v. Carlson, 249 S.W.2d 58 (Tex. 1952)(assumes without holding, that money owed as a result of fraud and deceit is sworn account; issue was sufficiency of sworn account affidavit);

Rizk v. Financial Guardian Ins. Agency, Inc., 584 S.W.2d 860 (Tex. 1979)(sworn account for insurance premiums; summary judgment for creditor reversed because defendant filed a verified denial);

Harmes v. Arklatex Corp., 615 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. 1981)(debtor liable in suit on sworn account to recover costs in drilling oil well);

Vance v. Holloway, 689 S.W.2d 403 (Tex. 1985)(sworn account for expenses on oil lease; reversed court of appeals and affirmed trial court judgment for creditor, because debtor failed to file a verified denial);

Midland Western Bldg., L.L.C. v. First Serv. Air Conditioning Contrs., Inc., 300 S.W.3d 738, 739 (Tex. 2009)(sworn account for air conditioning services; reversed and remanded as to attorney's fees).

The following is a list of other sworn account cases, grouped by subject, without passage of title to personal property, though the scope of sworn account is not a specific issue in most of the cases.

c. Insurance Premiums

Bernsen v. Live Oaks Ins. Agency, Inc., 52 S.W.3d 306 (Tex. App.–Corpus Christi 2001, no pet.); *Smith v. Cigna Prop. & Cas.*, No. 06-97-00140-CV (Tex. App.–Texarkana, October 6, 1998, no pet.)(unpublished, 1998 Tex. App. Lexis 6199); *Webb v. Reynolds Transp.*, 949 S.W.2d 364 (Tex. App.–San Antonio 1997, no pet.)(experience-rated modification premiums).

Sworn Account

d. Electrical Utility Service

Andy's Sunmart # 352, Inc. v. Reliant Energy Retail Servs., L.L.C., No. 01-08-00890-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] Nov. 5, 2009, n.p.h.)(2009 Tex. App. LEXIS 8559)(mem. op.).

e. Freight Services

Airborne Freight Corp. v. CRB Mktg, Inc., 566 S.W.2d 573 (Tex. 1978)(apparently, freight services); *Continental Carbon Co. v. Sea-Land Serv., Inc.*, 27 S.W.3d 184 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2000, pet. denied)(ocean freight services).

f. Telephone Services

Mincron SBC Corp. v. Worldcom, Inc. 994 S.W.2d 785 (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.], 1999, no pet.)(telephone service terms subject to tariff); *Kanuco Tech. Corp. v. Worldcom Network Servs.*, 979 S.W.2d 368 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, no pet.)(telephone service charges subject to tariff).

g. Mailing Services

Innovative Mailing Solutions, Inc. v. Label Source, Inc., No. 2-09-129-CV (Tex. App.–Fort Worth, Feb. 4, 2010, n.p.h.)(2010 Tex. App. Lexis 834)(mem. op.).

h. Staffing Services

Myan Mgmt. Group, L.L.C. v. Adam Sparks Family Revocable Trust, 292 S.W.3d 750 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2009, n.p.h.).

i. Advertising

Beltline Antique Mall v. DFW Suburban Newspapers, Inc., No. 05-98-00977-CV (Tex.App–Dallas, August 31, 2000, no pet.)(unpublished, 2000 Tex. App. Lexis 5904)(newspaper advertising); *Heap v. Val-Pak*, No. 01-99-00255-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.], November 4, 1999, no pet.)(unpublished, 1999 Tex. App. Lexis 8286)(mailed advertising); *Livingston Ford Mercury, Inc. v. Haley*, 997 S.W.2d 425 (Tex. App.–Beaumont 1999, no pet.)(radio advertising).

j. Attorney's Fees

Panditi v. Apostle, 180 S.W.3d 924 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2006, no pet.)(fees due attorney from client); *Pantaze v. Welton*, No. 05-96-00509-CV (Tex. App.–Dallas, August 31, 1999, no pet.)(unpublished, 1999 Tex. App. Lexis 6564)(litigation expenses due attorney from client); *Wimberly v. Fritz, Byrne & Head, L.L.P.*, No. 03-00-00500-CV (Tex. App.–Austin, July 26, 2001, pet. dism'd by agr.)(unpublished, 2001 Tex. App. Lexis 4993); *Kahn v. Carlson*, No. 05-98-01415-CV (Tex. App.–Dallas, April 27, 2001, no pet.)(unpublished, 2001 Tex. App. Lexis 2767); *Wright v. Christian & Smith*, 950 S.W.2d 411(Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] 1997, no pet.).

k. Equipment Repairs

Smith v. CDI Rental Equip., Ltd., 310 S.W.3d 559 (Tex. App.–Tyler 2010, n.p.h.)(equipment repair charges; plaintiff's lack of standing was jurisdictional; reversed and rendered).

Sworn Account

l. Personal Property Lease - - Conflicting Cases

The courts disagree as to whether personal property leases are sworn accounts, even though the broad language of Rule 185 appears to include such claims. *Baldwin v. Liberty Leasing Co.*, No. 05-99-00267-CV (Tex. App.–Dallas, June 20, 2000, pet. denied)(unpublished, 2000 Tex. App. Lexis 4097)(personal property lease is basis of sworn account). *But see AKIB Constr., Inc. v. Neff Rental, Inc.*, No. 14-07-00063-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] April 3, 2008, no pet.)(2008 Tex. App. Lexis 2383)(mem. op.)(personal property lease is not basis for a suit on sworn account), citing *Schorer v. Box Service Co.*, 927 S.W.2d 132 (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.]1997, writ denied).

m. Credit Cards - - Conflicting Cases

The courts disagree as to whether credit cards are the proper subject of sworn account. If the account is based on a merchant-seller's credit card, rather than a bank's credit card, Rule 185 certainly appears to include such claims.

Financial Institution credit cards have been the subject of sworn account actions. *See Phillips v. Capital One Bank*, No. 01-96-01403-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.], August 27, 1998, no pet.)(unpublished, 1998 Tex. App. Lexis 5440)(suit on credit card contract is sworn account); *See also Citicorp Diners Club v. Hewitt*, No. 01-96-00706-CV(Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.], October 2, 1997, no pet.) (unpublished, 1997 Tex. App. Lexis 5219)(same); *but see Gellatly v. Unifund CCR Partners*, No. 01-07-00552-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.], July 3, 2008, no pet.)(2008 Tex. App. Lexis 5018)(mem. op.)(Rule 185 does not apply to a suit to recover credit card debt); *Resurgence Fin, L.L.C. v. Lawrence*, No. 01-08-00341-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.], October 8, 2009, n.p.h.)(2009 Tex. App. LEXIS 7927)(mem. op.)(same); *Tully v. Citibank, N.A.*, 173 S.W.3d 212 (Tex. App.–Texarkana 2005, no pet.)(credit card debt not sworn account); *Cavazos v. Citibank*, No. 01-04-00422-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] June 9, 2005, no pet.)(unpublished, 2005 Tex. App. Lexis 4484)(credit card account was not proper sworn account); *Young v. Am. Express Co.*, No. 06-01-00035-CV (Tex. App.–Texarkana, October 26, 2001, no pet.) (unpublished, 2001 Tex. App. Lexis 7217)(credit card debt involving advance of money by financial institution not sworn account); *Bird v. First Deposit Nat'l Bank*, 994 S.W.2d 280 (Tex. App.–El Paso 1999, pet. denied)(same).

3. Fallacy Two: Sworn Account Requires Specific Account Description

It was once required that a sworn account show the nature of each item, the date, and charge. *Williamsburg Nursing Home v. Paramedics, Inc.*, 460 S.W.2d 168, 169 (Tex. Civ. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] 1970, no writ).; *Hassler v. Texas Gypsum Co.* 525 S.W.2d 53, 55 (Tex. Civ. App.–Dallas 1975 no writ).

4. 1984 Amendment to Rule 185 Negating Specificity

Rule 185 was revised in 1984 to include, "No particularization or description of the nature of the account or claim is necessary unless the trial court sustains special exceptions to the pleadings." *Huddleston v. Case Power & Equip. Co.*, 748 S.W.2d 102, 103 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1988, no writ)(no particularization required); *Enernational Corp. v. Exploitation Eng'rs, Inc.* 705 S.W.2d 749, 750

Sworn Account

(Tex. App.–Houston [1st dist.] 1986, writ ref'd n.r.e.)(discusses 1984 “no particularization” change to Rule 185); *Culp v. Hawkins*, 711 S.W.2d 726, 727 (Tex. App.–Corpus Christi 1986, writ ref'd n.r.e.)(waiver of complaint as to sufficiency of sworn account affidavit by failing to specially except pursuant to Rules 185, 90); *Parra v. AT & T*, No. 05-97-01038-CV (Tex. App.–Dallas, November 2, 1999, no pet.)(unpublished, 1999 Tex. App. Lexis 8177)(relying on *Culp*, court holds that debtor waived issue as to sufficiency of sworn account affidavit by failing to specially except, citing “no particularization” portion of Rule 185, Rule 90).

5. Troublesome Cases Ignoring “No Particularization” Amendment

Some courts ignore the “no particularization” language of the 1984 revision to Rule 185 and mistakenly continue to require an itemized statement of the account. Homeowner’s association’s sworn account action to collect unpaid assessments held not proper Rule 185 action because the petition did not include an explanation of how the assessments were calculated. *Pine Trail Shores Owners’ Ass’n v. Aiken*, 160 S.W.3d 139 (Tex. App.–Tyler 2005, no pet.). The court reasoned that the action was not a claim for a liquidated amount and was therefore not suit on sworn account as a matter of law. The court ignores the “no particularization” language of Rule 185, citing a case that pre-dates the 1984 rule change.

Other cases ignoring the “no particularization” language of Rule 185 include: *Panditi v. Apostle*, 180 S.W.3d 924, 926 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2006, no pet.)(“account must show with reasonable certainty the name, date, and charge for each item, and provide specifics or details as to how the figures were arrived at.”); *Cespedes v. Am. Express-CA*, No. 13-05-385-CV (Tex. App.–Corpus Christi, May 10, 2007, no pet.)(2007 Tex. App. Lexis 3555)(mem. op.)(“account must contain systematic, itemized statement of goods or services sold”); *Wimberly v. Fritz, Byrne & Head, L.L.P.*, No. 03-00-00500-CV (Tex. App.–Austin, July 26, 2001, pet. dism’d by agr.)(unpublished, 2001 Tex. App. Lexis 4993)(same); *Foley v. Sears Roebuck & Co.*, No. 14-92-00932-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ)(unpublished, 1993 Tex. App. Lexis 1885) (account must identify nature of items, date of sale, and related charges); *Dibco Underground, Inc. v. JCF Bridge & Concrete, Inc.*, No. 03-09-00255-CV (Tex. App.–Austin, April 8, 2010, n.p.h.)(2010 Tex. App. Lexis 2531)(mem. op.)(“general statements contained in an affidavit without description of specific items are insufficient to comply with Rule 185”), *citing Powers v. Adams*, 2 S.W.3d 496, 499 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1999, no pet.)(itemized monthly statements of services rendered listing offsets, payments, and credits sufficient).

II. PLEADINGS

A. Petition

1. Form of Pleading

The following form was used in *Continental Carbon v Sea-Land Serv., Inc.*, 27 S.W.3d 184 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2000, pet. denied)(default judgment was affirmed, with no attack on the petition):

Business Dealings Account: Plaintiff sues on an account founded on business dealings

Sworn Account

between the parties and for which a systematic record has been kept. Defendant failed to pay as promised, to plaintiff's damage in the principal amount stated herein. All conditions precedent to plaintiff's recovery have occurred. The account is verified in the attached affidavit and itemized in Exhibit A. Alternatively, defendant is liable based on other grounds, for example, breach of contract and quantum meruit.]

B. The Affidavit

Rule 185 requires language that "such claim is within the knowledge of affiant, just and true, that it is due, and that all just and lawful offsets, payments and credits have been allowed." Our form affidavit is attached as appendix A. The Rule 185 language should be used verbatim.

If the affidavit does not contain the required language, there is no sworn account. *Griswold v. Carlson*, 249 S.W.2d 58 (Tex. 1952)(sworn account affidavit signed by creditor's attorney fatally defective because it failed to state "within the knowledge of affiant the cause of action is just and true. . ."). The opposite result was reached in *Parra v. AT & T*, No. 05-97-01038-CV (Tex. App.—Dallas, November 2, 1999, no pet.)(unpublished, 1999 Tex. App. Lexis 8177). The court reasoned that the 1984 amendment to Rule 185 made the affidavit's knowledge requirement a waivable defect of form.

C. Attachments to Petition (Caution)

Normally, the sworn account suit affidavit, Appendix A, and the statement or invoices are attached to the petition. But review them from a defense perspective. Do they raise issues as to whether debtor is the proper party? Do they raise usury issues? Are the documents accurate and consistent with the petition? We occasionally sue without attaching invoices or a statement. This appears authorized under the "no-particularization" language discussed in the preceding section. Alternatively, creditor or its counsel can prepare and attach a summary of invoices, as long as they are not wrongfully alleged to be records made in the ordinary course of business.

Records attached to the petition may themselves create issues. See *Sundance Oil Co. v. Aztec Pipe & Supply Co.*, 576 S.W.2d 780 (Tex. 1978)(summary judgment reversed because invoice contained name of debtor and a third party creating a fact issue as to responsible party); *Smith v. CDI Rental Equip., Ltd.*, 310 S.W.3d 559 (Tex. App.—Tyler 2010, n.p.h.)(variance between name of plaintiff and name of creditor; held, plaintiff's lack of standing is jurisdictional, reversed and rendered); *Lakhani v. Switzer Petroleum Prods.*, No. 05-97-01621-CV (Tex. App.—Dallas, July 26, 2001, no pet.)(unpublished, 2001 Tex. App. Lexis 5019)(evidence at trial established seller was not plaintiff but a third party; reversed and rendered against creditor because of material variance between evidence and pleadings); *Kiva, Inc. v. Cent. Tex. Barricades*, No. 03-07-000684-CV (Tex. App.—Austin, Jan. 8, 2010, n.p.h.)(2010 Tex. App. LEXIS 89)(mem. op.)(invoices, statements, and reports attached to creditor's affidavit and petition did not establish a liquidated claim; held, not a sworn account, reversed and rendered against creditor). Attachments should clearly and accurately reflect the amount claimed on creditor's affidavit.

Sworn Account

D. The Answer

1. Requirements of Sworn Denial

Rule 185 states that creditor's sworn account claim, ". . . shall be taken as prima facie evidence thereof, unless the party resisting such claim shall file a written denial, under oath. A party resisting such a sworn claim shall comply with the rules of pleading as are required in any other kind of suit, provided, however, that if he does not timely file a written denial, under oath, he shall not be permitted to deny the claim, or any item therein, as the case may be"

Early cases required debtor to precisely plead, "each and every item is not just or true or that some specified item is not just and true." See *Red Top Products, Inc. v. T & R Chemicals, Inc.*, 619 S.W.2d 562, 563 (Tex. Civ. App. - - San Antonio, 1981, no writ). However, Rule 185 was amended in 1984 to allow pleading as required in any other suit. Butterworth, Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 70 (1984). Nearly any sworn denial is now sufficient. However, a sworn general denial is insufficient to satisfy the requirements of Rule 185 or 93(10); *Huddleston v. Case Power & Equip. Co.*, 748 S.W. 2d 102, 103 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1985, no writ). A sworn response to a creditor's summary judgment motion is insufficient. A sworn answer is required. *Rush v. Montgomery Ward*, 757 S.W.2d 521, 523 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1988, writ denied). See also *Sundance Res., Inc. v. Dialog Wireline Servs., L.L.C.*, No. 06-08-00137-CV (Tex. App.–Texarkana, April 8, 2009, n.p.h.)(2009 Tex. App. Lexis 2345)(mem. op.)(summary judgment on sworn account affirmed because defendant's affiant did not aver personal knowledge of facts stated in defendant's answer).

If plaintiff filed a proper sworn account, defendant must file a sworn denial satisfying Rules 93(10) and 185, or defendant may not dispute the receipt of the items or services, correctness of charges or ownership of account. Rules 93(10), 185; *Vance v. Holloway*, 689 S.W.2d 403, 404 (Tex. 1985).

2. Affirmative Defenses - - Allowed Without Sworn Denial

Without a Rule 185 sworn denial of account, debtor may present defenses not inconsistent with accuracy of the account. These defenses are often referred to as affirmative defenses and most are referenced in Rule 93, Verified Pleas; Rule 94, Affirmative Defenses; and Rule 95, Payment. In *Rizk v. Financial Guardian Ins. Agency, Inc.*, 584 S.W.2d 860, 863 (Tex. 1979), the court noted that defenses of failure of consideration and statute of limitations could be raised in the absence of a verified denial. See also *Schneider v. A-K Tex. Venture Capital, L.C.*, No. 14-00-00377-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.], April 12, 2001, no pet.)(unpublished, 2001 Tex. App. Lexis 2439)(defenses of confession and avoidance available, in absence of proper denial of sworn account). The safest debtor practice is to file a verified denial and to plead affirmative defenses, if the facts allow.

Sworn Account

III. ELEMENTS

A. Generally

If a defendant files a verified denial, plaintiff must present evidence proving: 1) sale and delivery of merchandise or performance of services; 2) that the amount of the account is just, agreed, or in the absence of agreement, that charges are usual, customary or reasonable, and 3) the amount remains unpaid. *Burch v. Hancock*, 56 S.W.3d 257, 264 (Tex. App.–Tyler 2001, no pet.); *Superior Derrick Servs., Inc. v. Anderson*, 831 S.W.2d 868, 872 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th dist.] 1992, writ denied). See also *Ton's Remodeling v. Fung's Kitchen, Inc.*, No. 01-05-01077-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] June 21, 2007, pet. denied)(2007 Tex. App. Lexis 4812)(mem. op.).

B. Order as Additional Element

The court apparently adds an element in *Wright v. Christian & Smith*, 950 S.W.2d 411, 413 (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.]1997, no writ). In this attorney fee case, the court recognizes the three familiar elements, above, citing *Thorpe v. Adair & Meyers*, 809 S.W.2d 306, 307 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1991, no writ). But the court adds an element “...we conclude that proof of an agreement to pay for services rendered is implicit in the requirement that [creditor] prove their performance of services.” Proof of debtor’s order has also been required by other cases.

Essential elements of proof of a claim on a sworn account are, generally, the [1] order for merchandise and [2] its delivery, [3] the justness of the account, that is, that the prices charged were agreed upon by the parties, or, in absence of an agreement, the prices were usual, customary or reasonable, and [4] the amount that is due and unpaid on the account. *Arndt v. National Supply Company, Et Al*, 633 S.W.2d 919, 922 (Tex. Civ. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1982 writ ref’d n.r.e.), citing *Brooks v. Eaton Yale and Towne, Inc.*, 474 S.W.2d 321, 323 (Tex. Civ. App.–Waco 1971, no writ)

C. Price

Proof of a suit on a sworn account does not require an express agreement; in the absence of an agreement, the plaintiff can meet the second requirement by showing that the charges were usual, customary, or reasonable. *Lopez v. M. G. Bldg. Materials, Ltd.*, No. 04-08-00550-CV (Tex. App.–San Antonio, June 3, 2009, n.p.h.)(2009 Tex. App. Lexis 3815)(mem. op.). But see *Arrellano v. J&K Garment Restoration Co.* (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] December 28, 2006, no pet.)(2006 Tex. App. Lexis 11072)(mem. op.)(no evidence that prices charged were usual, customary, and reasonable; judgment reversed and rendered that creditor take nothing on its suit on account).

Evidence as to usual, customary or reasonable prices is not relevant when there is a contract and the contract price should be proven. If the account is for insurance premiums, the policies should be admitted in evidence. *Bluebonnet Express, Inc. v. Employers Ins. Of Wausau*, 651 S.W.2d 345, 354 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.)(reversed and rendered against creditor; no proof that premiums charged were in accord with the express contracts of insurance)(disapproved on other grounds *Horrocks v. Texas Dept. of Transp.*, 852 S.W.2d 498, 499 (Tex. 1993). Likewise,

Sworn Account

if a tariff is relevant to the transaction, prove the tariff, as it generally supercedes prior contractual arrangements under the “filed rate doctrine.” See, e.g., *Kanuco Tech. Corp. v. Worldcom Network Servs.* 979 S.W.2d 368 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, no pet.)(telephone service; charges subject to tariff); *Mincron SBC Corp. v. Worldcom Inc.*, 994 S.W.2d 785 (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] 1999, no pet.)(telephone service).

D. Amount Due

See *Prompt Prof'l Real Estate, Inc. v. RSC Equip. Rental, Inc.*, No. 05-08-00398-CV (Tex. App.–Dallas May 5, 2009, n.p.h.)(2009 Tex. App. Lexis 3099)(mem. op.)(the fact that creditor made a pre-suit demand for less than amount sued did not create a genuine issue of material fact precluding summary judgment on uncontroverted summary-judgment evidence establishing the amount due).

IV. PROOF

A. Business Records Affidavit

Creditor's cases are based on business records. Summary judgment motions and trial preparation should customarily include a business records affidavit, Texas Rules of Evidence 902(10). The affidavit allows the nearly automatic admission of documents, which usually includes the statement of account (account summary), and invoices. Such records may satisfy creditor's burden of proof, *Morgan v. O'Beirne*, 429 S.W.2d 569, 572 (Tex. Civ. App.–Dallas 1968, no writ)(audit billing, invoices, ledger sheets and policy admitted as business records, though third party-auditor did not testify). Failure to prove the invoices are business records may be fatal to a sworn account claim. *Siegler v. Williams*, 658 S.W.2d 236 (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] 1983, no writ). Computer print-outs may be admitted as business records. *Voss v. Southwestern Bell Tel. Co.*, 610 S.W.2d 537 (Tex. Civ. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] 1980 writ ref'd n.r.e.). A 1975 statement of account for insurance premiums, prepared at credit manager's request, which accrued in 1972 and 1973 was not an admissible business record. *Carr Well Service, Inc. v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*, 587 S.W.2d 62 (Tex. Civ. App.–El Paso, 1979, no writ)

B. Services Affidavit

Civil Practice and Remedies Code, §18.001 provides for an affidavit concerning costs and necessity of services. Routinely used by personal injury attorneys, it is rarely employed by commercial litigators. For causes of action commenced before September 1, 2007, if one files and serves the affidavit on the other parties at least 30 days before trial, its contents are incontrovertible, unless a counter-affidavit is timely filed and served. For causes of action commenced on or after September 1, 2007, the filing requirement is omitted. See Act of June 15, 2007, 80th Leg., R.S., Ch. 978, CPRC 18.001, and O'CONNOR'S CPRC Plus (2007-2008), pages 99-100. The services affidavit presumably could be used to prove a debt based on services rendered; or attorney's fees in virtually any case except a sworn account action. **The services affidavit cannot be used in sworn account actions.** However, after a verified answer to a sworn account, one could amend, abandon the sworn account action, and proceed to trial on alternate claims.

Sworn Account

C. Discovery With Petition

Standard discovery, including requests for admission, should generally be served with the citation, see form, appendix B. Debtor has 50 days after service to answer such discovery, see Rules 197.2(a), Rule 198.2(a). Responses to discovery are generally more substantiative if a statement of account or the invoices are attached to the petition.

A default judgment may be bolstered by a motion for default judgment, with an attached affidavit establishing service and lack of response to attached admissions. Without such a motion, the deemed admissions are not part of the court file or subsequent record. Deemed admissions provide alternate proof of the claim, in the event the judgment is attacked. *See Continental Carbon Co. v. Sea-Land Serv., Inc.*, 27 S.W.3d 184, 190 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2000, pet. denied)(default judgment attack; deemed admissions established debt).

The attached form discovery also aids creditor in proving its case through summary judgment or trial. The debtor sometimes ignores the discovery resulting in deemed admissions. Many of the attached admissions were discussed and enforced as deemed admissions in *Continental Carbon*. The discovery, when answered, generally results in admission of some of creditor's elements.

V. DEFENSES

A. Negating Elements

A debtor's first defense is to negate one of the sworn account elements (see "Elements"). Assuming a proper verified answer is filed, debtor prevails if creditor fails to prove a required element. Debtor's counsel should carefully review the petition. Is the sworn account affidavit proper? Is the account consistent with the petition? Is the seller on the attached invoice or statement the same as the plaintiff? Is the debtor's name identical on the invoices, statement, and petition? Any variance could open the account to attack under the stranger to the transaction defense, next section.

B. Stranger to the Transaction

If debtor is not named on the invoice or statement as he is named in the petition, the suit may be subject to the stranger to the transaction defense. *Sundance Oil Co. v. Aztec Pipe & Supply Co.*, 576 S.W.2d 780 (Tex. 1978); *Hassler v. Texas Gypsum Co.*, 525 S.W. 2d 53 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1975, no writ)(invoices named corporation, not individual defendant); *Sanders v. Total Heat & Air, Inc.*, 248 S.W.3d 907, 914 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2008, no pet.)(invoices named general contractor, not the defendant homeowner). To avoid this defense plaintiff should plead that John Doe does business as Doe Co. if the invoices bill Doe Co., and it is John Doe's proprietorship. Plaintiff should also consider suit against multiple defendants under a partnership theory, if the facts allow.

C. Payment

Payment: If the account was paid, or credits are due, debtor should plead payment pursuant to Rule 95. Surprisingly, payment is one of the most difficult matters to plead. Rule 95 states:

Sworn Account

When a defendant shall desire to prove payment, he shall file with his plea an account stating distinctly the nature of such payment, and the several items thereof; **failing to do so, he shall not be allowed to prove the same**, unless it be so plainly and particularly described in the plea as to give the plaintiff full notice of the character thereof (emphasis added).

Absence of a proper plea renders payment evidence inadmissible. *Garner v. Fidelity Bank, N.A.*, 244 S.W.3d 855, 861 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2008, no pet.)(creditor’s objections to debtor’s unpleaded evidence of payment properly sustained; summary judgment on note affirmed); *De La Calzada v. Am. First Nat’l Bank*, No. 14-07-00022-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.], February 7, 2008, n.p.h)(2008 Tex. App. Lexis 880)(mem. op.)(guaranty); *Rea v. Sunbelt Savings, FSB, Dallas*, 822 S.W.2d 370, 372-373 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1991, no writ)(promissory note); *Mays v. Bank One, N.A.*, 150 S.W.3d 897 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2004, no pet.)(real estate note); *Obasi v. Univ. of Okla. Health Sci. Ctr.*, No. 04-04-00016-CV (Tex. App.–San Antonio, October 27, 2004, pet. denied)(mem. op.)(2004 Tex. App. Lexis 9435)(student loan-promissory note); *Capers v. Citibank (South Dakota)*, N.A., No. 05-05-01230-CV (Tex. App.–Dallas, October 25, 2006, no pet.)(2006 Tex. App. Lexis 9175)(mem. op.)(credit card contract).

VI. MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

A. Generally

Many sworn account claims are resolved through a motion for summary judgment (“Motion”). The reader is referred to other articles on the subject, including Summary Judgments in Collection Cases, *Collecting Debts & Judgments*, University of Houston Law Foundation; and *Summary Judgments in Texas*, Hittner and Liberato, 54 Baylor L. Rev. 1, Winter 2002.

B. Specificity of Motion

“The motion for summary judgment shall state the specific grounds therefor.” Rule 166a(c). A Motion based on debtor’s insufficient answer must be specific. *McConnell v. Southside Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 858 S.W.2d 337, 339 (Tex. 1993). The *McConnell* court specifically disapproved of an earlier case which allowed a vague allegation as to the insufficiency of debtor’s answer, *Bado Equip. Co. v. Ryder Truck Lines, Inc.*, 612 S.W.2d 81-82 (Tex. Civ. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1981, writ ref’d n.r.e.). *Bado* held that a motion stating that “defendant’s answer is insufficient in law to constitute a defense,” was sufficient. See also *Robinson v. Texas Timberjack, Inc.*, 175 S.W.3d 528 (Tex. App.–Texarkana 2005, no pet.)(plaintiff’s summary judgment motion failed to mention defendant’s insufficient answer to sworn account; plaintiff could not rely on insufficient answer to support summary judgment). Creditor’s motion should include:

“This is a suit on a sworn account. Plaintiff’s affidavit attached to the petition establishes the account balance and is prima facie evidence of Plaintiff’s claim. Defendant’s insufficient answer renders Defendant unable to deny the claim and Plaintiff is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.”

Sworn Account

C. Obtain Ruling on Objections

Objections to summary judgment evidence should be ruled upon prior to consideration of the motion, or they are waived. Consider requesting a record, but at least obtain entry of an order, which states the court's ruling on each objection. *Grant-Brooks v. Transamerica Bank, N.A.*, No. 05-02-00754-CV (Tex. App.–Dallas, January 31, 2003, no pet.)(unpublished, 2003 Tex. App. Lexis 990)(debtor waived objections by obtaining no ruling).

D. Affidavits As Summary Judgment Evidence

1. Personal Knowledge Requirement

Rule 166a(f) states: Supporting and opposing affidavits shall be made on personal knowledge, shall set forth facts as would be admissible in evidence, and shall show affirmatively that the affiant is competent to testify to the matters stated therein. An affidavit which does not positively and unqualifiedly represent the facts as disclosed in the affidavit to be true and within the affiant's personal knowledge is legally insufficient. *Humphreys v. Caldwell*, 888 S.W. 2d 469, 470 (Tex. 1994).

In *Robinson v. Texas Timberjack, Inc.*, 175 S.W.3d 528 (Tex. App.–Texarkana 2005, no pet.), the court held that plaintiff's affidavit was insufficient because it failed to show how the agent acquired personal knowledge of the facts. To be sufficient, the affidavit must affirmatively show how the affiant became personally familiar with the facts. *Id.* at 531, citing *Fair Woman, Inc. v. Transland Mgmt. Corp.*, 766 S.W.2d 323 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1989, no writ). *But see Requipco, Inc. v. Am-Tex Tank & Equip.*, 738 S.W.2d 299, 301 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1987, writ ref'd n.r.e.)(affidavit of plaintiff's president stating, "I have personal knowledge of all facts," held sufficient).

2. Readily Controverted Requirement

Summary judgment affidavits in creditor's cases invariably involve affidavits of creditor and debtor, which are affidavits of interested witnesses. As such, they may be subject to objection. Rule 166a(c) states:

A summary judgment may be based on uncontroverted testimonial evidence of an interested witness. . . if the evidence is clear, positive and direct, otherwise credible and free from contradictions and inconsistencies, and could have been readily controverted.

In *Thomas N. Heap, D.D.S., Inc. v. Val-Pak*, No. 01-00-00756-CV, (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] June 21, 2001, pet. denied)(unpublished, 2001 Tex. App. Lexis 4147), the court applied Rule 166a(c) to respondent's summary judgment evidence. Respondent - debtor's affidavit was an affidavit of an interested witness and described an agreement between himself personally and himself as president of his corporation. The court held that the affidavit was not capable of being readily

Sworn Account

controverted and was not competent summary judgment evidence.

3. Avoid Conclusory Statements

In *Life Ins. Co. of Virginia v. Gar-Dal, Inc.* 570 S.W.2d 378 (Tex. 1978) the court considered a vague affidavit of respondent - debtor, asserting unspecified offsets and payments. The court held such was insufficient to raise a fact issue. The court quoted with approval from *Smith v. Crockett Production Credit Assoc.*, 372 S.W.2d 956 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston 1963, writ ref'd n. r. e.). In rejecting a vague debtor's affidavit the Houston court stated:

“However, we are of the view that the plea in appellant Smiths' affidavit, there being nothing more, stating that all offsets and credits have not been allowed, is but a conclusion. It should have gone further and specified what such credits and offsets were. If this had been a trial on the merits and the only thing stated by appellant was that all offsets and payments had not been credited, the court would have been required to instruct a verdict against appellant. His testimony in such a trial, that all payments and offsets had not been allowed, without more, would be a pure conclusion. See *Franklin Life Ins. Co. v. Rogers*, 316 S.W.2d 116 (CCA), ref., n.r.e.”

“ . . . [I]t is axiomatic that legal conclusions are insufficient to raise issues of fact . . .” *CGM Valve & Gauge Co., Inc. v. Energy Valve, Inc.* 698 S.W.2d 253, 254 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1985, no writ). See also *Schultz v. General Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 704 S.W.2d 797, 798 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1985, no writ)(conclusory statement regarding disposition of collateral was insufficient to support summary judgment).

E. Other Summary Judgment Cases

Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Garrison Contrs. 966 S.W.2d 482 (Tex.1998)(debtor raised fact issue through affidavits asserting that creditor's agreement misrepresented amount of retrospective premiums); *Boodhwani v. Bartosh*, No. 03-02-0432-CV(Tex. App.—Austin, March 6, 2003, no pet.)(2003 Tex. App. Lexis 1907)(mem. op.)(debtor filed no sworn answer; sworn response to creditor's motion for summary judgment therefore ineffectual); *Rush v. Montgomery Ward*, 757 S.W.2d 521, 523, (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1988 writ denied (same)); *Grant-Brooks v. Transamerica Bank, N.A.*, No. 05-02-00754-CV (Tex. App.—Dallas, January 31, 2003, no pet.)(2003 Tex. App. Lexis 990)(mem. op.)(summary judgment affidavit from creditor's legal account specialist was sufficient though sale was apparently by a third party; debtor waived objections by failing to obtain ruling).

A summary judgment motion based on sworn account, should include an alternate request for judgment based on breach of contract. If the court rejects the sworn account, creditor may yet prevail. See *Cavazos v. Citibank*, No. 01-04-00422-CV (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] June 9, 2005, no pet.)(unpublished, 2005 Tex. App. Lexis 4484)(court rendered judgment on contract claim after rejecting sworn account).

Account Stated

PART TWO:

ACCOUNT STATED

I. DEFINITION OF ACCOUNT STATED

An account stated is an agreement between the parties who have had previous transactions of a monetary character that all the items of the account representing such transactions, and the balance struck, are correct, together with a promise, express or implied, for the payment of such balance. *Griffith v. Geffen & Jacobsen, P.C.* 693 S.W.2d 724, 726 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1985, no writ), citing *Eastern Dev. & Inv. Corp. v. City of San Antonio*, 557 S.W.2d 823, 824-25 (Tex. Civ. App.–San Antonio 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

II. ELEMENTS

The elements of an account stated are:

[1]. . . transactions between the parties which give rise to an indebtedness of one to the other; [2] an agreement, express or implied, between the parties fixing the amount due; and [3] a promise, express or implied, by the one to be charged, to pay such indebtedness. *Dulong v. Citibank (S.D.), N.A.*, 261 S.W.3d 890, 893 (Tex. App.–Dallas 2008, no pet.); *Arnold D. Kamen & Co. v. Young*, 466 S.W.2d 381, 388 (Tex. Civ. App.–Dallas 1971, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *Central Nat. Bank of San Angelo v. Cox* 96 S.W.2d 746 (Tex. Civ. App.–Austin 1936 writ dismissed); citing *Glasco v. Frazer* 225 S.W.2d 633, 635 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1949, writ dismissed).

III. PLEADING

Pleading account stated should include an allegation of each element. “To bring an action on an account stated it would be incumbent on plaintiff to allege in his petition that the defendant admitted the correctness of the account and that he expressly or impliedly assented to it.” *Unit Inc. v. 10 Eych-Shaw, Inc.*, 524 S.W.2d 330, 334 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1975, writ ref'd n.r.e.); citing *Reed v. Harris* 37 Tex. 167, 169 (Tex. 1872).

A creditor can recover attorney's fees under Chapter 38 based upon an account stated claim. *See Busch v. Hudson & Keyse, LLC*, No. 14-09-00009-CV (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.], May 11, 2010, n.p.h.)(2010 Tex. App. Lexis 3477)(mem. op.); Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 38.001(8)(oral or written contract).