

In the
Court of Appeals
Second Appellate District of Texas
at Fort Worth

No. 02-25-00544-CV

Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr.,

Appellant,

versus

Automotive Financial Group Incorporated; and AFG Companies
Incorporated,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

versus

Travis Gates; Genuine Lifetime, LLC; and Tyler Luck,

Defendants-Appellees,

On Appeal from the 48th District Court
Tarrant County, Texas
Trial Court No. 048-352249-24¹

**DECLARATION OF MAURICE FITZPATRICK, JR., IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO REINSTATE APPEAL NO. 02-25-00544-CV**

¹ Appellant filed identical notices of appeal in trial court cause numbers 017-352358-24 and 048-352358-24 challenging, among other civil rights and due process deprivations, the trial court's failure to "adjudicate" intervention and its imposition of a *de facto* denial of Appellant's Motion to Intervene (November 12, 2024). Without prior notice to Appellant, these two trial court cases were consolidated into trial court cause number 048-352249-24 on October 8, 2025, styled *Automotive Financial Group Inc. and AFG Companies, Inc. v. Travis Gates, Genuine Lifetime, LLC, and Tyler Luck*, pending in the 48th District Court of Tarrant County, Texas.

TO THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE SECOND COURT OF APPEALS:

I, Maurice Fitzpatrick, declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am the Appellant in the above-captioned matter and competent to make this Declaration.
2. On January 6, 2026, the Hon. Chief District Judge Reed O'Connor of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division, issued an order of remand in Case No. 4:25-cv-01272-O (Doc. Nos. 15, 16, and 17). See Exhibit 2, PageIDs 2653 - 2662.
3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Pacer and/or CM/ECF docket printout in the federal case 4:25-cv-01272-O, printed/captured on January 7, 2026, at 9:20 PM CST.
4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**, consisting of true and correct copies of Doc. Nos. 15 through 17 as reflected on the official CM/ECF civil docket in the federal case 4:25-cv-01272-O.
5. These documents were personally downloaded by me from the Court's electronic filing system.
6. **Exhibits 3 through 6** respectively incorporates by reference, as if stated fully herein, the full dockets and all filings in the related federal and/or federal appellate proceedings:
 - a. 4:25-cv-01272-O (N.D. Tex., Fort Worth Division);
 - b. 3:25-cv-00114-S-BN (N.D. Tex., Dallas Division);

- c. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals Case No. 25-10541; and
- d. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals Case No. 25-11354.

7. These filings are submitted in support of my *Appellant's Motion to Reinstate Appeal No. 02-25-00544-CV*, in accordance with this Court's January 6, 2026, order allowing reinstatement upon proof of remand.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 7, 2026,

/s/ Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr.
Maurice Fitzpatrick, pro se
Homeless, No Permanent Address
General Delivery
Dallas, TX 75260-9999
Telephone: (214) 694-1551
Email: afglawsuit@yahoo.com

Attached Exhibits:

#	Description
1	Printout of CM/ECF civil docket in the federal case 4:25-cv-01272-O, dtd 1/7/2026 at 9:20 PM CST
2	Doc. Nos. 15 through 17 as reflected on the official CM/ECF docket in the federal case 4:25-cv-01272-O (See Exhibit 1)

Exhibits Incorporated by Reference:

#	Description
3	full docket and filings in related federal proceedings, Case No. 4:25-cv-01272-O
4	full docket and filings in related federal proceedings, Case No. 3:25-CV-00114-S-BN
5	full docket and filings in related federal appellate proceedings, Appeal No. 25-10541
6	full docket and filings in related federal appellate proceedings, Appeal No. 25-11354

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

Pursuant to Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 10.1(a)(5) and the Second Court of Appeals (Local Rule 3.B), I certify that conference with Appellees' counsel was not possible and would have been impracticable.

Appellees and their counsel have previously obstructed and bypassed my lawful and active appeal(s), including this appeal, filed in October 2025, by removing underlying proceedings to federal court while appellate jurisdiction was active and/or pending, and have repeatedly failed to engage or respond in good faith regarding appellate, jurisdictional, or other issues.

Under these circumstances, meaningful conference was and remains impossible. Accordingly, no conference occurred.

I certify this statement is true and correct.

DATED: January 9, 2026

/s/ Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr.
Maurice Fitzpatrick, pro se
Homeless, No Permanent Address
General Delivery
Dallas, TX 75260-9999
Telephone: (214) 694-1551
Email: afglawsuit@yahoo.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Appellant, Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr., hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing, *Declaration of Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr., in Support of Motion to Reinstate Appeal No. 02-25-00544-CV*, and attached exhibits, was served upon known attorney(s) of record of all parties to the above appeal through the Court's electronic filing system on January 7, 2026, and on January 9, 2026, to include certificate of conference.

/s/ Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr.
Maurice Fitzpatrick, pro se
Homeless, No Permanent Address
General Delivery
Dallas, TX 75260-9999
Telephone: (214) 694-1551
Email: afglawsuit@yahoo.com

Automated Certificate of eService

This automated certificate of service was created by the eFiling system. The filer served this document via email generated by the eFiling system on the date and to the persons listed below. The rules governing certificates of service have not changed. Filers must still provide a certificate of service that complies with all applicable rules.

Envelope ID: 109853301

Filing Code Description: Motion

Filing Description: APPELLANT???S MOTION TO REINSTATE APPEAL
NO. 02-25-00544-CV

Status as of 1/9/2026 11:14 AM CST

Case Contacts

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Maurice Fitzpatrick		afglawsuit@yahoo.com	1/9/2026 9:34:52 AM	SENT
Tyler J.Luck		myarbrough@buchalter.com	1/9/2026 9:34:52 AM	SENT
Matthew EYarbrough		myarbrough@buchalter.com	1/9/2026 9:34:52 AM	SENT
Shauna JWright		shauna.wright@kellyhart.com	1/9/2026 9:34:52 AM	SENT
Shauna JWright		shauna.wright@kellyhart.com	1/9/2026 9:34:52 AM	SENT

EXHIBIT 1

Printout of official CM/ECF civil docket in the federal case 4:25-cv-01272-O

CLOSED,JURY

**U.S. District Court
Northern District of Texas (Fort Worth)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 4:25-cv-01272-O**

AFG Companies Inc v. Genuine Lifetime LLC et al
Assigned to: Chief District Judge Reed O'Connor
Demand: \$4,000,000
Case in other court: 48th Judicial District Court of Tarrant County,
048-352249-24
Cause: 28:1332 Diversity-Notice of Removal

Date Filed: 11/10/2025
Date Terminated: 01/06/2026
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 190 Contract: Other Contract
Jurisdiction: Diversity

Plaintiff

AFG Companies Inc

represented by **Shauna J Wright**
Kelly Hart & Hallman LLP
201 Main St
Suite 2500
Fort Worth, TX 76102
817/332-2500
Fax: 817/878-9280
Email: shauna.wright@kellyhart.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Christian Martinez
Kelly Hart & Hallman LLP
201 Main Street
Suite 2500
Fort Worth, TX 76102
817-332-2500
Fax: 817-878-9280
Email: christian.martinez@kellyhart.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Klayton Sweitzer Hiland
Kelly Hart & Hallman LLP
201 Main Street
Suite 2500
Fort Worth, TX 76102
817-878-3584
Fax: 817-878-9280
Email: klayton.hiland@kellyhart.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Leslie M Sanderson
Scheef & Stone LLP
2601 Network Blvd
Suite 102
Frisco, TX 75034
214/472-2140
Fax: 214/472-2150

Mark L Hill
Henry Hill PLLC
6801 Gaylord Parkway
Ste 400
Frisco, TX 75034
972-755-0002
Email: mhill@henryhilltx.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Mary Wahne Baker
Henry Hill PLLC
6801 Gaylord Pkwy
Ste 400

Frisco, TX 75034
972-755-0002
Fax: 972-755-0004
Email: mbaker@henryhilltx.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Meredith Welch Knudsen
Kelly Hart & Hallman LLP
201 Main Street, Suite 2500
Fort Worth, TX 76102
817-878-3578
Fax: 817-878-9778
Email: meredith.knudsen@kellyhart.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Stephanie Nicole Garner
Kelly Hart & Hallman LLP
201 Main Street
Suite 2500
Fort Worth, TX 76102
817-332-2500
Fax: 817-878-9280

Steven Ovando
Scheef & Stone LLP
2600 Network Boulevard
Suite 400
Frisco, TX 75034
214-472-2100
Fax: 214-472-2150

V.

Defendant

Genuine Lifetime LLC

represented by **Matthew Elliott Yarbrough**
Buchalter LLP
100 Crescent Ct.
Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75201
214-263-7500
Email: myarbrough@buchalter.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Asher K Miller
McCathern PLLC
3710 Rawlins
Suite 1600
Dallas, TX 75219
214-741-2662
Fax: 214-741-4717
Email: amiller@mccathernlaw.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Justin Neal Bryan
McCathern PLLC
3710 Rawlins, Suite 1600
Dallas, TX 75229
214-741-2662
Fax: 214-741-4717
Email: jbryan@mccathernlaw.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Levi G McCathern , II
McCathern PLLC
3710 Rawlins Street, Suite 1600
Dallas, TX 75219
214-741-2662

Fax: 214-741-4717
 Email: lmccathern@mccathernlaw.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Shane Eghbal
 McCathern PLLC
 3710 Rawlins Street, Suite 1600
 Dallas, TX 75219
 214-741-2662
 Fax: 214-741-4717
 Email: seghbal@mccathernlaw.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Jason A Blackstone
 Buchalter, A Professional Corporation
 100 Crescent Court
 Suite 700
 Dallas, TX 75201
 214-707-7781
 Email: jblackstone@buchalter.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Tyler J. Luck

represented by **Matthew Elliott Yarbrough**
 (See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Asher K Miller
 (See above for address)
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Justin Neal Bryan
 (See above for address)
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Levi G McCathern , II
 (See above for address)
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Shane Eghbal
 (See above for address)
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Jason A Blackstone
 (See above for address)
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr

represented by **Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr**
 General Delivery
 Dallas 75260-9999
 214-694-1551
 Email: afglawsuit@yahoo.com
PRO SE

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
11/10/2025	<u>1</u>	NOTICE OF REMOVAL WITH JURY DEMAND filed by Genuine Lifetime LLC, Tyler Luck. (Filing fee \$405; receipt number ATXNDC-15976717) In each Notice of Electronic Filing, the judge assignment is indicated, and a link to the Judges Copy Requirements and Judge Specific Requirements is provided. The court reminds the filer that any required copy of this and future documents must be delivered to the judge, in the manner prescribed, within three business days of filing. Unless exempted, attorneys who are not admitted to practice in the Northern District of Texas must seek admission promptly. Forms and Instructions found at www.txnd.uscourts.gov , or by clicking here: Attorney Information - Bar Membership . If admission requirements are not satisfied within 21 days, the clerk will notify the presiding judge. (Blackstone, Jason) (Entered: 11/10/2025)

11/12/2025	2	ORDER REQUIRING SCHEDULING CONFERENCE AND REPORT FOR CONTENTS OF SCHEDULING ORDER: The Joint Report shall be filed on or before December 10, 2025 (Ordered by Chief District Judge Reed O'Connor on 11/12/2025) (mmw) (Entered: 11/12/2025)
11/13/2025	3	New Case Notes: A filing fee has been paid. File to: Judge O Connor. Pursuant to Misc. Order 6, Plaintiff is provided the Notice of Right to Consent to Proceed Before A U.S. Magistrate Judge. Clerk to provide copy to plaintiff if not received electronically. Attorneys are further reminded that, if necessary, they must comply with Local Rule 83.10(a) within 14 days or risk the possible dismissal of this case without prejudice or without further notice. (mmw) (Entered: 11/13/2025)
11/17/2025	4	ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS to 1 Notice of Removal,,,, by Defendants Genuine Lifetime LLC, Tyler Luck. (Attachments: # 1 Docket Sheet, # 2 Index of Documents - State Court Case, # 3 Documents from State Court Case, pt. 1 of 4, # 4 pt. 2 of 4, # 5 pt. 3 of 4, # 6 pt. 4 of 4) (Yarbrough, Matthew) (Entered: 11/17/2025)
11/21/2025	5	MOTION to Remand filed by AFG Companies Inc with Brief/Memorandum in Support. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit(s), # 2 Exhibit(s), # 3 Exhibit(s), # 4 Exhibit(s), # 5 Exhibit(s)) (Wright, Shauna) (Entered: 11/21/2025)
11/21/2025	6	Brief/Memorandum in Support filed by AFG Companies Inc re 5 MOTION to Remand (Wright, Shauna) (Entered: 11/21/2025)
12/01/2025	7	NOTICE of <i>JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE, CIVIL RIGHTS OBJECTIONS, AND REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION</i> re: 4 Additional Attachments to Main Document, 6 Brief/Memorandum in Support of Motion, 1 Notice of Removal,,,, 5 MOTION to Remand filed by Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr (Fitzpatrick, Maurice) (Entered: 12/01/2025)
12/03/2025	8	ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS to 7 Notice (Other), by Defendant Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit(s) email-from-federal-court-cm-ecf-system-4_25-cv-01272-O-11212025-1536, # 2 Exhibit(s) email-from-federal-court-cm-ecf-system-4_25-cv-01272-O-11212025-1537, # 3 Exhibit(s) email-request-for-clarification-11212025-2300) (Fitzpatrick, Maurice) (Entered: 12/03/2025)
12/10/2025	9	Joint STATUS REPORT <i>Regarding Contents of Scheduling Order</i> filed by AFG Companies Inc. (Wright, Shauna) (Entered: 12/10/2025)
12/11/2025	10	NOTICE of <i>Supplemental Notice of Maurice Fitzpatrick Regarding Doc. No. 9 (Joint Status Report), Renewed Jurisdictional Challenge, and Objection to Litigation Proceeding Under Fraudulent and Unexamined Presumptions</i> re: 9 Status Report filed by Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr (Fitzpatrick, Maurice) (Entered: 12/11/2025)
12/12/2025	11	RESPONSE filed by Genuine Lifetime LLC, Tyler J. Luck re: 5 MOTION to Remand (Yarbrough, Matthew) (Entered: 12/12/2025)
12/23/2025	12	REPLY filed by AFG Companies Inc re: 5 MOTION to Remand (Wright, Shauna) (Entered: 12/23/2025)
12/23/2025	13	MOTION to Transfer Case out of District/Division filed by Genuine Lifetime LLC, Tyler J. Luck with Brief/Memorandum in Support. (Yarbrough, Matthew) (Entered: 12/23/2025)
12/25/2025	14	Supplemental Document by Maurice Fitzpatrick, Jr as to 11 Response/Objection, 12 Reply, 13 MOTION to Transfer Case out of District/Division <i>Second Supplemental Declaration of Maurice Fitzpatrick w/Exhibits A through R (Transcripts, Audio Links)</i> . (Attachments: # 1 Declaration(s) Second Supplemental Declaration of Maurice Fitzpatrick) (Fitzpatrick, Maurice) (Entered: 12/25/2025)
01/06/2026	15	ORDER: Because there is not complete diversity between the parties and had no reasonable basis for removal, the Court ORDERS that the case be remanded to the 48th Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, and GRANTS AFG's motion for attorney's fees. AFG is DIRECTED to submit its schedule of costs and fees for filing this Motion within seven days of this order. Defendants will have seven days thereafter to file any objection. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to transmit a certified copy of this Order to the appropriate clerk. Defendants' Motion to Transfer Venue (ECF No. 13) is DENIED as moot. (Ordered by Chief District Judge Reed O'Connor on 1/6/2026) (wxc) (Entered: 01/06/2026)
01/06/2026	16	Remand letter to 48th Judicial District Court of Tarrant County with certified order 15 , 17 and docket sheet. (wxc) (Entered: 01/06/2026)
01/06/2026	17	FINAL JUDGMENT: This case is REMANDED to the 48th Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas. 2. The clerk shall return this case using the standard process and shall transmit a true copy of this Judgment to the parties. (Ordered by Chief District Judge Reed O'Connor on 1/6/2026) (wxc) (Entered: 01/06/2026)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
01/07/2026 18:50:22			
PACER Login:	afglawsuit	Client Code:	
Description:	Docket Report	Search Criteria:	4:25-cv-01272-O
Billable Pages:	5	Cost:	0.50

EXHIBIT 2

Doc. Nos. 15 through 17

As reflected on the official CM/ECF civil docket printout in the federal case 4:25-cv-01272-O

contract against Tyler Luck and Genuine Lifetime, LLC. *See AFG Companies, Inc. v. Genuine Lifetime, LLC and Tyler Luck*, Cause No. 017-352358-24 (“17th District Case”). AFG filed a Motion to Consolidate in the 48th District Case, and Judge Taylor of the Tarrant County 48th Judicial District consolidated the cases, ruling from the bench on the Motion on October 8, 2025, and issued a follow-up written order on October 11, 2025. Tyler Luck, and Genuine Lifetime, LLC removed from the 48th Judicial District to federal court on November 10, 2025, only removing the 17th District Case and parties. AFG filed a motion to remand on November 21, 2025, which is now ripe for the Court’s review.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and must have statutory or constitutional power to adjudicate a claim. *See Home Builders Ass’n of Miss., Inc. v. City of Madison*, 143 F.3d 1006, 1010 (5th Cir. 1998). To that end, federal courts have an independent duty, at any level of the proceedings, to determine whether it properly has subject matter jurisdiction over a case. *Ruhgras AG v. Marathon Oil Co.*, 526 U.S. 574, 583 (1999) (“[S]ubject-matter delineations must be policed by the courts on their own initiative even at the highest level.”). “Motions for remand are governed by 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c), which provides that ‘[i]f at any time before final judgment it appears that the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, the case shall be remanded.’” *Denley Group, LLC v. Safeco Ins. Co. of Indiana*, No. 3:15-CV-1183- B, 2015 WL 5836226, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 30, 2015) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c)).

28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) permits the removal of “any civil action brought in a [s]tate court of which the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction.” The statute allows a defendant to “remove a state court action to federal court only if the action could have originally been filed in federal court.” *Anderson v. Am. Airlines, Inc.*, 2 F.3d 590, 593 (5th Cir. 1993). In

policing the precise boundaries of their limited jurisdiction, federal courts strictly construe the removal statute because “removal jurisdiction raises significant federalism concerns.” *Willy v. Coastal Corp.*, 855 F.2d 1160, 1164 (5th Cir. 1988). Therefore, “any doubts concerning removal must be resolved against removal and in favor of remanding the case back to state court.” *Cross v. Bankers Multiple Line Ins.*, 810 F. Supp. 748, 750 (N.D. Tex. 1992). The removing party has the burden of proving federal jurisdiction and, if challenged, that the removal was procedurally proper. *See Garcia v. Koch Oil Co. of Tex. Inc.*, 351 F.3d 636, 638 (5th Cir. 2003). The right to remove depends upon the plaintiff’s pleading at the time of the petition for removal. *Pullman Co. v. Jenkins*, 305 U.S. 534, 537–38 (1939); *Cavallini v. State Farm Mutual Auto Ins.*, 44 F.3d 256, 264 (5th Cir. 1995).

Diversity jurisdiction requires that each plaintiff be diverse from each defendant. *Getty Oil Corp., a Div. of Texaco, Inc. v. Ins. Co. of N. Am.*, 841 F.2d 1254, 1258 (5th Cir. 1988); 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). “A civil action otherwise removable solely on the basis of the jurisdiction under section 1332(a) of this title may not be removed if any of the parties in interest properly joined and served as defendants is a citizen of the state in which such action is brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b)(2).

III. ANALYSIS

AFG asks for the Court to remand the case and for attorney’s fees. The Court addresses each in turn.

A. Motion to Remand

The Court **GRANTS** AFG’s Motion to remand because Defendants cannot remove only part of the case, and not all defendants are diverse from all plaintiffs. *Arango v. Guzman Travel Advisors Corp.*, 621 F.2d 1371, 1376 (5th Cir. 1980); *Getty Oil Corp.*, 841 F.2d at 1258. The Fifth

Circuit has construed 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) “to effect the removal of the entire action in multi-party suits.” *Arango*, 621 F.2d at 1376. Thus, a party cannot remove only a portion of a case or the claims contained in a particular complaint. *Mid-century Ins. Co. v. Philadelphia Indem. Ins. Co.*, No. 3:11-CV-2835-N, 2012 WL 12358929, at *5 (N.D. Tex. June 12, 2012) (“The Court . . . agrees that the term ‘civil action’ in section 1441(a) encompasses an entire state-court action rather than merely one third-party complaint.”) When a “partial removal” is attempted, the legal effect is to remove the entire state-court action, thereby requiring the Court to “analyze whether it has jurisdiction over the entirety of the action as it existed at the time the Notice of Removal was filed.” *Mid-century Ins. Co.*, 2012 WL 12358929 (citing *Dillon v. Mississippi*, 23 F.3d 915, 918–19 (5th Cir. 1994)).

AFG argues that Defendants improperly instituted a partial removal.¹ Defendants contend that removing only the parties and claims from the initial 17th District case was proper because AFG’s Motion for Consolidation in the state court proceedings “amounts to form manipulation” and “mirrors improper joinder scenarios where courts sever to prevent abuse.”² The Court agrees with AFG.

This case is not analogous to improper joinder scenarios. Improper joinder requires a showing that “(1) there was actual fraud in the pleading of jurisdictional facts; or (2) the plaintiff is unable to establish a cause of action against the non-diverse defendant in state court.” *Williams v. Homeland Ins. Co. of New York*, 18 F.4th 806, 812 (5th Cir. 2021) (citing *Smallwood v. Ill. Cent. R.R. Co.*, 385 F.3d 568, 573 (5th Cir. 2004) (en banc)). Defendants do not allege either.

The Fifth Circuit has also been willing to find that an unappealed state court “severance decision was tantamount to a finding of improper joinder.” *Crockett v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*,

¹ Br. in Supp. Mot. Remand 6–8, ECF No. 6.

² Defs.’ Resp. 6, ECF No. 11.

436 F.3d 529, 533 (5th Cir. 2006). Consequently, “[i]f the severance creates a civil action that satisfies the requirements for diversity jurisdiction, that action is removable.” 14C CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT, ARTHUR R. MILLER & EDWARD H. COOPER, FED. PRAC. & PROC. JURIS. § 3723 (Rev. 4th ed.); *see also Hoyt v. Lane Constr. Corp.*, 927 F.3d 287, 297 (5th Cir. 2019), *as revised* (Aug. 23, 2019). However, “[a] party whose presence in the [state court] action would destroy diversity must be dropped formally, as a matter of record, to permit removal.” 14C CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT, ARTHUR R. MILLER & EDWARD H. COOPER, FED. PRAC. & PROC. JURIS. § 3723 (Rev. 4th ed.); *see also Williams*, 18 F.4th at 815 (“*any* viable cause of action against a diversity-destroying party requires the entire case to be remanded.”) (emphasis in original). Here, the state court did not sever a non-diverse party; rather, the state court consolidated two cases and *added* a non-diverse party. To the extent Defendants allege the Court should act as an appellate court for the state court decision, overturn the motion to consolidate, sever the claims, then evaluate if diversity exists, they ask for something improper: “[f]ederal courts do not sit as appellate courts to review state court judgments,” *Krempp v. Dobbs*, 775 F.2d 1319, 1322 (5th Cir. 1985), and “precedent makes clear that we look at jurisdiction at the time of removal, not after a federal court severance.” *Williams*, 18 F.4th at 816; *accord. Flagg v. Stryker Corp.*, 819 F.3d 132, 137 (5th Cir. 2016).

Therefore, the Court “analyze[s] whether it has jurisdiction over the entirety of the action as it existed at the time the Notice of Removal was filed.” *Mid-century Ins. Co.*, 2012 WL 1358929 at *5 (quoting *Levert-St. John, Inc.*, 2006 WL 1875494, at *2). At the time of removal, Plaintiff AFG and Defendant Gates were both citizens of Texas. Thus, there is not complete diversity, and the Court does not have jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a); *Getty Oil Corp., a Div. of Texaco, Inc. v. Ins. Co. of N. Am.*, 841 F.2d 1254, 1258 (5th Cir. 1988).

Defendants further argue that remand is not warranted “[b]ecause Plaintiff has acknowledged federal jurisdiction in an analogous case”³ against it in the District of Wyoming. They are wrong. Subject matter jurisdiction is not waivable, and other cases are irrelevant to whether subject matter jurisdiction exists the present case. What matters is whether there exists \$75,000 in controversy and whether plaintiffs are completely diverse from all defendants in the case or controversy before the Court. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a); *Mas v. Perry*, 489 F.2d 1396, 1398–99 (5th Cir. 1974). As stated above, this Court does not have jurisdiction in this case as Gates is not diverse from AFG.

AFG also correctly argues that removal was not timely as it happened well beyond thirty days after Defendants were served.⁴ Defendants contend removal was timely because the consolidation order triggered the revival exception by changing the case, including adding the claims against Gates which “differ significantly from its claim against Genuine and Luck.”⁵ Defendants are incorrect. “The revival exception provides that a lapsed right to remove an initially removable case within thirty days is restored when the complaint is amended so substantially as to alter the character of the action and constitute essentially a new lawsuit.” *Johnson v. Heublein Inc.*, 227 F.3d 236, 241 (5th Cir. 2000). Thus, when the exception applies, it allows defendants an opportunity to remove from state court to “adjudicate a completely different claim.” *Id.* at 242 (citing 14C CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT, ARTHUR R. MILLER & EDWARD H. COOPER, FED. PRAC. & PROC. JURIS. § 3732, at 321 (1998)).

The revival exception does not apply here. The claims against Genuine Lifetime and Luck have not changed at all: the consolidation simply added the claims against Gates. Significantly,

³ Defs.’ Resp. 7, ECF No. 11.

⁴ Br. in Supp. Mot. Remand 9–10, ECF No. 6.

⁵ Defs.’ Resp. 7, ECF No. 11.

Defendants attempted to remove only the claims involved in the 17th District Case and omit the consolidated claims involving Gates. In other words, they sought to remove only the claims originally filed in the 17th District Case and leave behind the claims they rely on as triggering the exception. Therefore, Defendants' argument that the revival exception applies is meritless.

B. Motion for Attorney's Fees

A Court "may award attorney's fees under § 1447(c) only where the removing party lacked an objectively reasonable basis for seeking removal." *Martin v. Franklin Cap. Corp.*, 546 U.S. 132, 141 (2005).

Defendants unpersuasively argue that attorney's fees are not warranted because 1) "Defendants had an objectively reasonable basis for believing that . . . removal was timely and reasonable" under *Johnson* as the consolidation order "dramatically changed the nature of the statue court actions" and 2) that the parties from the 17th District Case, "Plaintiff AFG and Defendants Genuine and Luck[,] are completely diverse from one another."⁶

At bottom, Defendants removal amounts to an impermissible appeal of the state court judge's consolidation order. *Krempp*, 775 F.2d at 1322. It removed a case with a properly joined in-state defendant, and its attempt to remove only some of the parties is directly contrary to well-established Fifth Circuit precedent. *See Williams*, 18 F.4th at 816. Defendants provided no basis for believing they could remove after a state court consolidated two cases that added a non-diverse defendant. Finally, Defendants' argument that *Johnson* provides "an objectively reasonable basis" for renewing the removal deadline is unserious given that 1) the claims did against the Defendants did not change at all 2) their attempt at partial removal attempted to omit any all the claims that gave rise to changes it cites as the basis for changing the deadline. Because Defendants' removal

⁶ Defs.' Resp. 8, ECF No. 11.

lacks an objectively reasonable basis and is nothing more than an attempt to gain an “undeserved tactical advantage of seeing how the case goes in state court before removing,” attorney’s fees are awarded. *Johnson*, 227 F.3d at 242.

IV. CONCLUSION

Because there is not complete diversity between the parties and had no reasonable basis for removal, the Court **ORDERS** that the case be remanded to the 48th Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, and **GRANTS** AFG’s motion for attorney’s fees. AFG is **DIRECTED** to submit its schedule of costs and fees for filing this Motion within seven days of this order. Defendants will have seven days thereafter to file any objection. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to transmit a certified copy of this Order to the appropriate clerk. Defendants’ Motion to Transfer Venue (ECF No. 13) is **DENIED as moot**.

SO ORDERED on this **6th day of January, 2026**.



Reed O'Connor

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court
Northern District of Texas

Karen Mitchell
Clerk of Court

Fort Worth Division

January 6, 2026

48th District Court, Tarrant County
100 North Calhoun Street
Fort Worth, TX 76196

RE: Remand

Style: AFG Companies Inc v. Genuine Lifetime LLC et al-4:25-cv-01272-O

Dear Clerk:

Enclosed is a certified copy of an Order and/or Judgment remanding the above captioned case back to the 48th Judicial District Court of Tarrant County , 048-352249-24 along with a copy of the docket sheet.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, I may be reached at 817.850.6631 .

Sincerely,
Karen Mitchell, Clerk

By: s/Wendy Camargo
Deputy Clerk

Enclosure Docket sheet
Certified order

cc: Counsel of Record
Case file (public entry)

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

AFG COMPANIES INC,

Plaintiff,

v.

GENUINE LIFETIME, LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 4:25-cv-01272-O

FINAL JUDGMENT

This Judgment is issued pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(a).

This action came on for consideration by the Court, and the issues having been duly considered and a decision duly rendered,

It is **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED** that:

1. This case is **REMANDED** to the 48th Judicial District Court of Tarrant County, Texas.
2. The clerk shall return this case using the standard process and shall transmit a true copy of this Judgment to the parties.

SO ORDERED on this **6th day of January, 2026.**


Reed O'Connor

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE