



Fourth Court of Appeals
San Antonio, Texas

MEMORANDUM OPINION

No. 04-13-00437-CV

IN RE SOUTHLAND LLOYDS INSURANCE COMPANY

Original Mandamus Proceeding¹

PER CURIAM

Sitting: Catherine Stone, Chief Justice
Patricia O. Alvarez, Justice
Luz Elena D. Chapa, Justice

Delivered and Filed: August 28, 2013

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS DENIED

On July 11, 2013, relator Southland Lloyds Insurance Company filed a petition for writ of mandamus seeking review of the trial court's stated reasons for granting a new trial after previously granting traditional and no-evidence motions for summary judgment in favor of relator.

Texas trial courts are afforded broad discretion in granting new trials. *See Johnson v. Fourth Court of Appeals*, 700 S.W.2d 916, 918 (Tex. 1985). To date, the Texas Supreme Court has only provided for a very limited review of a trial court's order granting a new trial after a jury's verdict. *See In re United Scaffolding, Inc.*, 377 S.W.3d 685, 686 (Tex. 2012) (orig. proceeding); *In re Columbia Med. Ctr.*, 290 S.W.3d 204, 209-10 (Tex. 2009) (orig. proceeding). This court has previously declined to conduct a substantive review of a trial court's stated reasons for granting a

¹ This proceeding arises out of Cause No. 10-12-12408-ZCV, styled *Estefana Loera v. Southland Lloyds Insurance Company*, pending in the 293rd Judicial District Court, Zavala County, Texas, the Honorable Cynthia L. Muniz presiding.

new trial on mandamus. *See In re Discount Tire Co. of Tex.*, No. 04-12-00850-CV, 2013 WL 241953 (Tex. App.—San Antonio Jan. 23, 2013, orig. proceeding) (mem. op); *In re State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, No. 04-11-00708-CV, 2011 WL 4830177 (Tex. App.—San Antonio Oct. 12, 2011, orig. proceeding) (mem. op.); *In re Camp Mystic, Inc.*, No. 04-11-00694-CV, 2011 WL 4591194 (Tex. App.—San Antonio Oct. 5, 2011, orig. proceeding). Because we conclude the trial court's orders in this case satisfy the requirement for specificity set out in *In re Columbia* and further articulated in *In re United Scaffolding*, no further review is available on mandamus. *See United Scaffolding*, 377 S.W.3d at 688; *Columbia Med. Ctr.*, 290 S.W.3d at 213; *see also Discount Tire*, 2013 WL 241953, at *1. Having considered relator's petition for writ of mandamus and the response filed by real party in interest Estefana Loera, the court is of the opinion that relator is not entitled to the relief sought. Accordingly, the petition for writ of mandamus is denied. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 52.8(a).

PER CURIAM