

Affirmed and Plurality and Concurring Opinions filed August 31, 2021.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-19-00645-CV

CRYSTAL DOLGENER, Appellant

V.

STEVEN DOLGENER, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 280th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 2019-27998**

CONCURRING OPINION

I concur in the judgment and join in the portions of the opinion except as to issues one, two, three, and ten.

Regarding issues one, two, and three, the court analyzes the legal and factual sufficiency of the evidence that family violence has occurred and was directed at each “protected person.” While I agree with the court’s analysis on each issue, it is not necessary to reach all of those issues in order to uphold the protective order. What is required is legal and factual sufficiency of the evidence of family violence

generally. Under the facts of this case, overruling any one of issues one, two, or three renders the remaining issues moot. The court's opinion should not be read to suggest otherwise.

Regarding issue ten, the court does not discuss Crystal's decision to wait until the protective order was rendered before filing her motion to transfer the protective-order proceeding from the 280th District Court to the 245th District Court. That would appear to be a significant fact.

I concur in the judgment and otherwise join in the court's opinion.

/s/ Charles A. Spain
Justice

Panel consists of Justices Spain, Hassan, and Poissant. (Spain, J., concurring, joined by Hassan, J.).