NO			
	§	In the Justice Court of	County, Texas
	§	Precinct	Place
Plaintiff(s)			
vs.	§		
	§		
	§		
Defentant(s)	§		
<u>PLAINTI</u>	IFF'S ORIG	GINAL PETITION	
TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID CO	OURT:		
COMES NOW,		("P	laintiff(s)) filing this
Plaintiff's Original Petition, discovery (if	any) will l	oe conducted under Level 1	, pursuant to Rule 190.2
of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, and f	or cause	of action, would respectfo	ully show:
	PAR	<u>ries</u>	
	1		
Plaintiff(s) is/are an [individual] residing	g in	County, T	exas.
	2		
Defendant,		, is a (corporat	cion, limited liability
company, limited liability partnersh	ip, sole	proprietorship, genera	l partnership, other
; ' strik ı	e through	r which does not apply'),	whose usual place of
business/parking lot address is:			

		Cou	unty	of	, -	Texas
and may be served with process at th	he address of	its registe	ered ag	gent being p	er Texas Secr	etary
of State Business Records: Name of a	agent:					
Service address of agent:						
	3.					
Defendant,		, is	a (c	orporation,	limited lia	bility
company, limited liability partner	rship, sole	proprieto	rship,	general pa	artnership,	other
; ' stı	rike through	which doe	es not	apply'), who	ose usual pla	ce of
business/parking lot address is:						
		County	of		-	Texas
and may be served with process at the	he address of	its registe	ered ag	gent being p	er Texas Secr	etary
of State Business Records: Name of a	agent:					
Service address of agent:						

JURISDCTION AND VENUE

4.

This Court has jurisdiction and venue of the cause of action under the Texas Government Code and Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code, because the amount in controversy is less than \$20,000, the subject matter cause of action may be adjudicated by the Court and the cause of action arose at Defendant's usual place of business in the county the Court is located.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is [a member of Defendant's gym/is a tenant in Defendant's apartment complex,
strikethrough the nonapplicable option] and uses parking lot facilities made available by
Defendant.
Plaintiff(s) legally parked his/her/their vehicle in a parking lot space located at
(address or parking lot),, County, Texas, provided by and under the control of
Defendant(s), as a consequence of [Plaintiff being a tenant in the apartment complex where vehicle
parking premises are provided for such tenants / Plaintiff use of gym exercise facilities at which Plaintiff is
a member where vehicle parking premises are provided for members and/or guests, strike through the
inapplicable option].
6.
Plaintiff(s), an invitee, use of a parking lot space provided by and under the control of Defendant, was at
the express or implied invitation of Defendant(s) and Plaintiff(s) entered thereon either as a member of
the public for a purpose for which the parking lot is held open to the public or for a purpose connected
with the business of Defendant that does or may result in their mutual economic benefit.
7.
On or about (date and time), upon Plaintiff's return to the parking lot location where
Plaintiff had parked their vehicle, Plaintiff discovered that the parked vehicle was [stolen / incurred
damages because of the criminal act of an unknown and unauthorized third party break-in into the vehicle
/ Plaintiff sustained personal injury as a result of an encounter with the person(s) involved with the

unauthorized break-in/ theft of Plaintiff's parked vehicle, strike through the inapplicable option]. The

rollowing personal	property was st	olen from th	e venicie as a	consequence	or the criminal ac
(strikethrough		if	not		applicable)
(

8.

Upon written demand presented by Plaintiff to Defendant, Defendant denied any liability to compensate Plaintiff for their harm, damage and/or injury associated with the criminal act committed upon Plaintiff's vehicle parked in Defendant's parking lot.

CAUSE OF ACTION – NEGLIGENCE CLAIM

9.

Defendant breached its duty to Plaintiff, an invitee, to keep the parking lot under its control in a safe condition and to reasonably protect Plaintiff against parked vehicle theft or break-in criminal activity in the parking lot, and negligently failed to provide reasonable safe parking lot premises and sufficient security measures that would prevent or reduce the risk of occurrence of vehicle theft or break-ins, loss of personal property and/or personal injury. Defendants actions and/or omissions constituted negligence, because of Defendant's failure to do that which a person of ordinary prudence would have done under the same or similar circumstances and the negligent conduct was a direct and proximate cause of the [stolen vehicle/break-in damage to the vehicle/ personal injury to Plaintiff/loss of Plaintiff's personal property; strike through non applicable options] made the basis of this lawsuit.

The Defendants negligent actions or omissions include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- Defendant failed to provide reasonable parking lot security;
- Defendant failed to timely and properly notify Plaintiff of the risk of criminal activity on the parking lot and what actions Plaintiff should take to avoid being a crime victim;
- Defendant failed to provide a reasonably safe parking lot for the safety of Plaintiff, an invitee.

Defendant had a duty to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would use to avoid harm to others, including but not limited to damage to personal property and personal injury, under circumstances similar to those described herein. Defendant breached this duty.

11.

Plaintiff's suffered harm, damages and/or injuries which were directly and proximately caused by Defendants negligent, careless, and reckless disregard of said duty. Plaintiffs will show that the above foregoing acts and/or omissions, constitute negligence that directly and proximately caused the occurrence of Plaintiffs injuries, harm and/or damages. Plaintiffs injuries, harm and/or damages resulting from Defendant's negligence are described in paragraph 16. below.

CAUSE OF ACTION - PREMISES LIABILTIY (ALTERNATIVE CLAIM)-

12.

Defendant, who had control of the parking lot premises, breached its duty to Plaintiff to use ordinary care to protect Plaintiff, an invitee, from criminal acts of third parties associated with the [theft/break-in/personal injury] associated with Plaintiff's vehicle parked in the parking lot premises, because Defendant knew or had reason to know of a (1) foreseeable and (2) unreasonable risk of harm to the Plaintiff associated with such criminal act, and breach of that duty is the proximate cause of Plaintiff

suffering damages, harm and/or injury. Further, Defendant breached its duty to Plaintiff to keep the parking lot under its control in a safe condition.

13.

<u>Foreseeability</u>. Defendant knew or had reason to know of foreseeability of risk of harm to Plaintiff because of:

- Proximity Plaintiff's evidence will show that other crimes have occurred on the parking lot and its immediate vicinity known by Defendant;
- Recency and Frequency Plaintiff's evidence will show that previous crimes have recently
 occurred on the parking lot premises, as well as immediate past, and such crimes has occurred
 frequently many times and not isolated events known by Defendant;
- Similarity Plaintiff's evidence will show previous crimes on the parking lot are sufficiently similar to the crime suffered by Plaintiff as to place the Defendant on notice of the specific danger.
- Publicity Plaintiff's evidence will show Defendant knew or had reason to know of publicity surrounding the previous crimes and they knew or should have known of a foreseeable danger to Plaintiff.

14.

<u>Unreasonableness.</u> Defendant breached its duty owed to Plaintiff to reduce or eliminate the unreasonable risk of harm created by Defendant failing to have adequate vehicle theft/break-in security systems and procedures in place in the parking lot. Defendant knew or had reason to know of the foreseeability of prior similar criminal activity on the parking lot and the risk such criminal activity is one Plaintiff is to be protected against and the likelihood of harm to Plaintiff's person and/or harm to Plaintiff's property. The Defendant's failure to exercise reasonable security systems in place in the parking lot to eliminate or reduce the risk of harm to Plaintiff, is a proximate cause of damage to Plaintiff. The risk of

foreseeable harm to Plaintiff is unreasonable because the risk of the foreseeable crimes outweighs the burden placed on Defendant to prevent or reduce it.

Plaintiffs injuries and/or damages resulting from Defendant's premises liability are described in paragraph 16. below.

CAUSE OF ACTION - BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF HABITABILITY (ALTERNATIVE CLAIM)-

(Strike this entire section if the suit is not against an apartment)

15.

Defendant, pursuant to Texas Property Code, Title 8, Landlord and Tenant Chapter 92, Residential Tenancies, breached its duty of implied warranty of habitability owed to Plaintiff, a tenant.

- Before filing this suit, Plaintiff gave timely written notice to Defendant concerning Defendant's unsafe parking lot condition associated with Plaintiff being concerned about their safety and Plaintiff being unreasonably exposed to potential unsafe personal injury from encountering criminals in the act of breaking into or stealing Plaintiff's parked vehicle legally parked in Defendant's parking lot;
- Defendant after receiving timely written notice from Plaintiff, failed to timely remedy the unsafe parking lot condition and breached its duty of implied warranty of habitability owed to Plaintiff;
- As a consequence of Defendant not timely fixing, repairing or installing reasonable security systems and processes and safety notices issued to Plaintiff, in Defendant's parking lot, the purpose of which is to prevent and/or reduce the risk of parked vehicle theft or break-ins and consequent associated and foreseeable encounter of a vehicle owner with criminals and their foreseeable follow-on defensive and assaultive behaviour risk directed upon Plaintiff, a tenant,

directly and proximately materially affects the physical health or safety of Plaintiff, an ordinary tenant, and damages incurred by Plaintiff as a consequence of its vehicle being stolen/broken into/personal property stolen from Plaintiff's vehicle.

Plaintiffs damages resulting from Defendant's breach of its duty of implied warrant of habitability
 owed to Plaintiff are described in paragraph 16. below.

DAMAGES

16.

As a direct and proximate result of the [negligent acts and/or omissions of Defendant; breach of Defendant's premises liability duty owed to Plaintiff; Defendant's breach of its implied warranty of habitability, *strike through non-applicable options*], Plaintiffs have suffered damages for which Plaintiffs seek recovery from Defendant. Plaintiff requests recovery of the following damages from Defendant:

1.	Property Damage
	1.1. Value of stolen vehicle (\$) / Break-in damage to the vehicle (\$) (strike
	through any non-applicable damage).
	1.2. Value of personal property stolen from the vehicle (\$) (strike through if not applicable)
	1.3. Plaintiff's rent value decreased to (\$) because of the decreased rental value resulting
	from the unsafe condition (strike through if suit is not against an apartment);
2.	Personal Injury Damages (strike through if not applicable or suit is against an apartment)
	2.1 Past medical expenses:

- 2.2. Past physical pain and suffering;
- 2.3. Past physical impairment;
- 2.4. Past mental anguish and suffering;

- 2.5. Past lost wages and loss of consortium;
- 2.6. Future medical expenses;
- 2.7. Future physical pain and suffering;
- 2.8. Future physical impairment;
- 2.9. Future mental anguish and suffering; and
- 2.10. Future lost wages and future loss of consortium.

JURY/BENCH TRIAL

18.

- () Contemporaneous with the filing herewith, Plaintiffs have paid or will pay a jury fee and make a demand that the case be brought before the jury for a trial on all matters.
- () Plaintiff requests the case be heard by the Court, bench trial, and not by jury.

(strikethrough the nonapplicable option)

PRAYER

19.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED,

Plaintiffs respectfully pray that Defendant be cited to appear and answer herein, and that upon final trial and hearing hereof, Plaintiffs recover a judgment over and against Defendant for the damages as pled herein, based upon the evidence, in the amounts the jury/Court determines to be fair and reasonable, and for such other and further relief, at law and in equity, to which the Plaintiffs may show themselves justly entitled. Petitioner prays for general relief.

Plaintiff be awarded costs of court and attorney fees.

As a consequence of Defendant's breach of its implied warranty of habitability owed to Plaintiff, a tenant,

Plaintiff requests the Court, upon Plaintiff's election, to (strikethrough these awards if suit is not against

an apartment):

- Issue an Order to Defendant directing it to timely take steps to remedy the unsafe condition;
 and/or
- Issue an Order that reduces Plaintiff's rent according to the decreased rental value resulting from the unsafe condition; or
- Grant a judgment to Plaintiff for one month's rent plus \$500; or

Respectfully submitted,

mail address. (Tick this box if Plaintiff so consents)

 Grant a judgment for the amount of the Plaintiff's actual damages resulting from the unsafe condition;

Court costs and attorneys' fees excluding those relating to recoveries for personal injury

(Notice to Reader: Plaintiff's damages and amount in controversy under the Texas Property Code in regard to a claim of breach of implied warranty of habitability, including attorney's fees, cannot exceed \$10,000).

Plaintiff, Pro Se State Bar No.(if an attorney): ______

Address: _____

County of _____, Texas.

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

E-Mail Address: ______

Plaintiff consents to the e-mail service of the answer and any other motions or pleadings to this e-

	§	In the Justice Court of County, Texas
	§	Precinct Place
Plaintiff(s)		
VS.	§	
	§	
§		
Defentant(s)	§	
FINAL JUDGMEN	T FOR P	LAINTIFF (BENCH TRIAL)
On, 20	, this cas	se was tried.
Plaintiff appeared $\ \square$ in person $\ \square$ by attorn	ey:	
Defendant appeared ☐ in person ☐ by at	ttorney:	
	proved	cted. The judge, having heard the evidence and the allegations of the petition, and it is therefore
☐ the sum of \$,		
□ plus attorney's fees of \$		
☐ with interest at the rate of	% co	mpounded annually, and
☐ court costs of \$	·	
☐ the Court Orders Defendant to time obtaining no later than three months lot theft security assessment report a parking lot and implementing the report date, and to promptly notify conclusions and implementation plays safety. ☐ the Court Orders that Plaintiff's	nely takes from the assessing comme y Defendants of the serent of the rental variable.	e steps to remedy the unsafe condition, that includes he date of this Judgment, a third party expert parking g the risk of vehicle theft and vehicle break-in in the ndations of such report within three months of the dant's tenants in writing of the summary findings, e security report in regard to improving parking lot educed from \$ per month to \$ per alue resulting from the unsafe parking lot condition nth's rent of \$ plus \$500

NO. _____

ISSUED AND SIGNED on	_, 20
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCTPLACE	
COUNTY, TEXAS	

_ _

NO			
	§	In the Justice Court of	County, Texas
	§	Precinct	Place
Plaintiff(s)	3		
VS.	§		
	§		
	J		
	§		
Defentant(s)	§		
	3		
JUDGMENT	FOR PLA	LINTIFF (JURY TRIAL)	
On, 20			
Plaintiff appeared □ in person □ by attorn			
Defendant appeared ☐ in person ☐ by a			
A jury of qualified citizens of the county was verdict for Plaintiff and assesses damages in			
It is therefore ORDERED that Plaintiff recove	er of Defe	endant:	
☐ the sum of \$,			
□ plus attorney's fees of \$			
☐ with interest at the rate of	% co	mpounded annually, and	
court costs of \$	·		
☐ the Court Orders Defendant to tir obtaining no later than three month lot theft security assessment report parking lot and implementing the r report date, and to promptly notif conclusions and implementation places that Plaintiff month which reflects the decreased	is from the assessing ecomme fy Defendants of the assessing the asset as a second the assessing the assessing the	ne date of this Judgment, a the graph of the risk of vehicle theft and industriant of such report with dant's tenants in writing of e security report in regard seduced from \$ per negard seduced	hird party expert parking and vehicle break-in in the thin three months of the f the summary findings to improving parking lowers. The summary findings to improving parking lowers.

☐ grants a judgment to Plaintiff for one month's rent of \$	_ plus \$500
ISSUED AND SIGNED on, 20	
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT PLACE COUNTY, TEXAS	