

CAUSE NO. DC-21-12504

Harriet Nicholson,
Plaintiff

192nd District Court

v.

Nationstar Mortgage, LLC.
Defendants

Dallas County, Texas

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Now Comes Plaintiff, Harriet Nicholson, and files this her Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and would show unto the Court the following:

I. SUMMARY OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action to vacate a void order and judgment rendered in the 48th Judiciary District Court, Tarrant County, Texas because the Court had no jurisdiction of the parties, no jurisdiction of the subject matter, no jurisdiction to enter the judgment, or no capacity to act as a court in cause 048-276347-15 styled *Harriet Nicholson v. Nationstar Mortgage, LLC* after March 17, 2021.

2. The 48th Judiciary District of Tarrant County rendered void orders in cause 048-276347-15 while the Second Court of Appeals had exclusive

plenary jurisdiction after Plaintiff perfected an appeal of “Order Denying Plaintiff’s Motion to Set Status Conference for Want of Jurisdiction” on March 17, 2021.

II. BACKGROUND FACTS

3. On January 18, 2015, Plaintiff filed suit against Nationstar Mortgage, LLC for unlawful servicing practices asserting causes of action for violation of the Texas Debt Collection Practices Act for deceptive debt collection activity and threatening unlawful foreclosure assigning case to the 48th District Court, 048-276347-15.

4. On February 8, 2016, Plaintiff filed her Fourth Amended Petition asserting causes of action for deceptive debt collection efforts, negligence and gross negligence per se, negligence, gross negligence, negligent misrepresentation and fraud. (Ex. A, true and correct certified copy of Plaintiff’s Fourth Amended Petition in case 048-276347-15)

5. On February 8, 2016, Nationstar Mortgage filed its Amended Answer and counterclaim for attorney’s fees. (Ex. B, true and correct certified copy Nationstar’s Amended Answer and Counterclaim)

6. On May 17, 2016, the trial court granted Nationstar No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment against Plaintiff’s Fourth Amended

Petition dismissing all claims with prejudice without disposing of Nationstar's counterclaim for attorney's fees. (Ex. C, true and correct certified copy Order Granting Defendants' No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment)

7. On February 23, 2021, Plaintiff filed a "Motion to Set Status Conference" because Nationstar's counterclaim for attorney's fees remained pending for more than five years.

8. On March 12, 2021, the 48th District Court signed "Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Set Status Conference for Want of Jurisdiction" determining Nationstar No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment was final without disposing of Nationstar's counterclaim for attorney's fees. (Ex. D, true and correct certified copy "Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Set Status Conference for Want of Jurisdiction")

9. On March 17, 2021, Plaintiff filed her "Notice of Appeal" appealing the "Order Denying Plaintiff Motion to Set Status Conference for Want of Jurisdiction". (Ex. E, true and correct certified copy of "Notice of Appeal"). Whether a trial court has subject matter jurisdiction is a question of law subject to de novo review. See Mayhew v. Town of Sunnyvale, 964 S.W.2d 922, 928 (Tex.1998), *cert. denied*, 526 U.S. 1144, 119 S.Ct. 2018,

143 L.Ed.2d 1030 (1999). The Second Court of Appeals assigned case number 02-21-00074-CV.

10. On May 21, 2021, while the case was pending in the Second Court of Appeals for de novo review of jurisdiction, the trial court signed an “Order Vacating Order Denying Motion to Set Status Conference for Want of Jurisdiction” (Ex. F, true and correct certified copy of “Order Vacating Order Denying Motion to Set Status Conference for Want of Jurisdiction”)

11. On July 13, 2021, while the case was pending in the Second Court of Appeals for de novo review of jurisdiction, the trial court signed a “Final Judgment”. (Ex. G, true and correct certified copy of “Final Judgment”).

A. Legal Standard.

12. The standard for granting traditional summary judgment is well established, and this Court is no doubt familiar with it. Nicholson is entitled to summary judgment on declaratory relief if there is no genuine issue of material fact and Nicholson is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Tex. R. Civ. P. 166a(c); *see also Carter v. City of Garland*, No. 05-16-00903-CV, 2017 WL 2118785, *1 (Tex. App.-Dallas May 16, 2017). Once she makes that showing, the burden shifts to Nationstar Mortgage, LLC to present evidence raising a genuine issue of material fact and precluding summary judgment. *Id.*

B. Nicholson Is Entitled to Summary Judgment Because the Trial Court's Orders signed after Plaintiff filed "Notice of Appeal" are void.

13. The filing of a notice of appeal by any party invokes the appellate court's jurisdiction over all parties to the trial court's judgment or order appealed from." Tex. R. App. P. 25.1. Once a case has been appealed, the appellate court has plenary jurisdiction over the subject matter of the appeal and, in the absence of express authorization by rule or statute, the trial court generally has no jurisdiction to change or modify its judgment during the pendency of the appeal. See *Robertson v. Ranger Ins. Co.*, 689 S.W.2d 209, 210 (Tex. 1985) (*per curiam*); *Carrillo v. State*, 480 S.W.2d 612, 616 (Tex. 1972); *Ammex Warehouse Co. v. Archer*, 381 S.W.2d 478, 482 (Tex. 1964); *see also Stubbs v. Stubbs*, 657 S.W.2d 10, 11-12 (Tex. App.-Dallas 1983, *no writ*) (recognizing that district court had no jurisdiction to consider a motion to modify an order on appeal because a trial court "generally has no jurisdiction to vacate or change a judgment once the case has been appealed")

14. The 48th District Court rendered orders at a time when the Second Court of Appeals had exclusive plenary jurisdiction over the case concerning the "Order Denying Plaintiffs Motion to Set Status Conference

for Want of Jurisdiction” on March 17, 2021.[3] See *Davis v. Huey*, 571 S.W.2d 859 (Tex.1978); *Carrillo v. State*, 480 S.W.2d 612 (Tex.1972); *Amex Warehouse Company v. Archer*, 381 S.W.2d 478 (Tex.1964). The 48th District Court had no power to change or modify its order once an appeal had been taken therefrom. Carrillo, 480 S.W.2d at 616.

15. A judgment is void when it is apparent that the court rendering the judgment had no jurisdiction of the parties, no jurisdiction of the subject matter, no jurisdiction to enter the judgment, or no capacity to act as a court. *Cook v. Cameron*, 733 S.W.2d 137, 140 (Tex.1987); *Browning v. Placke*, 698 S.W.2d 362, 363 (Tex.1985). *A void judgment is one entirely null within itself, and which is not susceptible of ratification or confirmation, and its nullity cannot be waived. Easterline v. Bean*, 121 Tex. 327, 49 S.W.2d 427, 429 (1932); *American Universal Ins. Co. v. D.B. & B., Inc.*, 725 S.W.2d 764, 766 (Tex. App.-Corpus Christi 1987, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Furthermore, if a court has not acquired jurisdiction of both the parties and the subject matter of the litigation, the judgment is void and is subject to both direct and collateral attack. *Browning*, 698 S.W.2d at 363; *Martin v. Sheppard*, 145 Tex. 639, 201 S.W.2d 810, 812 (1947); *American Universal Ins.*, 725 S.W.2d at 766.

16. If a trial court enters a judgment before it acquires jurisdiction of the parties, the judgment is void. *In re Mask*, 198 S.W.3d at 235; *In re B.A.G.*, 794 S.W.2d 510, 511-12 (Tex. App.-Corpus Christi 1990, no writ) (citing *Browning v. Placke*, 698 S.W.2d 362, 363 (Tex. 1985)).

17. The trial court's May 13, 2021 "Order Vacation Order Denying Motion to Set Status Conference" and the July 13, 2021 "Final Judgment" signed by the 48th District Court in cause 048-276347-15 is void; since that court, as shown by the record, had no jurisdiction to render those orders. *Austin Independent School District v. Sierra Club*, 495 S.W.2d 878 (Tex.1973).

III. DECLARATORY RELIEF

18. Plaintiff seeks declaratory judgement the 48th District Court's May 21, 2021 "Order Vacating Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Set Status Conference" and the July 13, 2021, "Final Judgment" are void because the Second Court of Appeals had exclusive plenary jurisdiction over the "Order Denying Plaintiff's Status Conference for Want of Jurisdiction" and, in the absence of express authorization by rule or statute, the trial court had no jurisdiction to render its May 21. 2021 "Order Vacating Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Set Status Conference" during the pendency of the appeal. See *Robertson v. Ranger Ins. Co.*, 689

S.W.2d 209, 210 (Tex. 1985) (per curiam); Carrillo v. State, 480 S.W.2d 612, 616 (Tex. 1972); Ammex Warehouse Co. v. Archer, 381 S.W.2d 478, 482 (Tex. 1964); see also Stubbs v. Stubbs, 657 S.W.2d 10, 11-12 (Tex. App.-Dallas 1983, no writ) (recognizing that district court had no jurisdiction to consider a motion to modify an order on appeal because a trial court "generally has no jurisdiction to vacate or change a judgment once the case has been appealed")

CONCLUSION & PRAYER

Wherefore, based on the foregoing, Nicholson prays the Court grants her declaratory relief the trial court orders/judgment signed on May 21, 2021 and July 13, 2021 in trial court case 048-276347-15 are null and void for lack of jurisdiction and Order the May 21, 2021 (Order Vacating Order Denying Motion to Set Status Conference for Want of Jurisdiction) and July 13, 2021 (Final Judgment) are vacated and Plaintiff is awarded costs, fees for this declaratory judgment, in addition to any other relief she is justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Harriet Nicholson
2951 Santa Sabina Drive
Grand Prairie, Texas 75052
817-217-0245
harrietcholson@yahoo.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On October 28, 2021, I certify I served all counsel of record.

/s/ Harriet Nicholson

CAUSE NO. 048-276347-15

HARRIET NICHOLSON
Plaintiff

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF

VS.

TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC
Defendant

48TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

PLAINTIFF'S FOURTH AMENDED PETITION

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

NOW COME, HARRIET NICHOLSON, Plaintiff, complaining about Nationstar Mortgage, LLC, Defendant in this, her **FOURTH** Amended Petition , and for cause of action would respectfully show unto the Court as follow to-wit:

I. PARTIES

- A. Plaintiff, Harriet Nicholson, is an individual residing in Tarrant County, Texas.
- B. Nationstar Mortgage, LLC, (Defendant") is a corporation doing business in the state of Texas; has appeared and answered.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The amount in controversy exceeds the minimum jurisdictional limits of this

FOURTH AMENDED PETITION



A CERTIFIED COPY
ATTEST: 10/27/2021
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK
TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS
BY: /s/ Kathy Ballard

1



CAUSE NO. 048-276347-15

HARRIET NICHOLSON
Plaintiff

VS.

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC
Defendant

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF

TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS

48TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER,
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES AND COUNTERCLAIM**

Comes now Defendant Nationstar Mortgage LLC, also hereinafter referred to as Defendant, and file its Affirmative Defenses, Amended Answer and Counterclaim and would show the Court as follows:

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. Defendant alleges the affirmative defense of laches and waiver.
2. Defendant asserts the affirmative defense of the statute of limitations.
3. Defendant asserts the affirmative defense of judicial estoppel.
4. Defendant asserts the affirmative defense of lack of consideration.
5. Defendant asserts the affirmative defense of failure to mitigate damages by the Plaintiff.
6. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff lacks standing to assert some of her claims and causes of action.
7. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff's claims are barred by the economic loss doctrine.
8. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff's claims are barred by collateral estoppel.
9. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff is not a consumer as that term is defined in the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act.
10. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff has not satisfied all conditions precedent for recovery under her claims and causes of action.



11. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff's claims are barred by the anti-waiver provision contained in Plaintiff's note, deed of trust, prior loan modification agreements, and loan modification negotiation agreement.
12. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part by Chapter 33 of the TEXAS CIVIL PRACTICE AND REMEDIES CODE because Plaintiff and third parties are responsible for a percentage of the harm for which relief is sought by Plaintiff. *See* TEXAS CIVIL PRACTICE & REMEDIES CODE §§ 33.001—33.016.
13. Plaintiff's claims and damages are barred in whole or in part due to pre-existing injuries and conditions of the Plaintiff.
14. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because Defendant's conduct was not the producing cause of Plaintiff's alleged losses, damages, and/or injuries.
15. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because Defendants' conduct was not the proximate cause of Plaintiff's alleged losses, damages, and/or injuries.
16. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because Plaintiff has unclean hands.
17. Defendant asserts the affirmative defense of bona fide error.
18. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because Plaintiff is unable to prove her alleged losses, damages, and/or injuries in accordance with Texas law.
19. Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery of her attorneys' fees.
20. Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery of exemplary damages.
21. Defendant is entitled to offset and recoupment in the amount the funds due and owing on the debt in the event Plaintiff is awarded any damages.
22. Defendant asserts that the Court lacks jurisdiction to determine all or some of Plaintiff's claims and causes of action.
23. Defendant asserts that Plaintiffs' claims are barred all or in part by the doctrine of ratification.
24. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff's claims are barred all or in part because Plaintiff have not sustained any damages.
25. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff's claims are barred all or in part due to Plaintiff's fraud.
26. Defendant further asserts that any damages allegedly suffered by Plaintiff, which damages Defendant vigorously denies, is the result of Plaintiff's own errors, breaches, prior breaches, misrepresentations, omissions, fraud, and any concealment thereof.

2 | Defendant's First Amended Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Counterclaim



27. Defendant asserts the applicability of Chapter 41 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code as an affirmative defense and further asserts that the exemplary damages, if any, which might be awarded are capped under Tex. Civ. Prac. Rem. Code, Section 41.008(b). Moreover, Defendant affirmatively asserts that any award of exemplary damages in this case would be grossly excessive and would not comply with due process under the Constitutions of either the United States or Texas.

GENERAL DENIAL

28. Subject to any special exceptions, Defendant enters a general denial to each and every allegation contained in Plaintiff's Original Petition, and any amendments and supplements thereto hereafter filed, pursuant to Rule 92 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant also reserves the right to amend its answer.

COUNTERCLAIM

29. Defendant counterclaims for its reasonable and necessary attorneys' fees and costs from Plaintiff pursuant to the Texas Finance Code and the Texas Declaratory Judgment Act.

WHEREFORE PREMISES CONSIDERED, Defendant prays that the court render a take nothing judgment against Plaintiff, assess costs against Plaintiff and award Defendant its attorneys' fees and all other relief to which it is entitled.

Respectfully submitted

HARVEY LAW GROUP

/s/ Kelly J. Harvey

Kelly J. Harvey

SBN: 09180150

kelly@kellyharvey.com

Mia D. Searles

SBN: 24068544

mia@kellyharvey.com

Jerry Mason

SBN: 24081794

Jerry@kellyharvey.com

3 | Defendant's First Amended Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Counterclaim

048-276347-15



A CERTIFIED COPY
ATTEST: 09/09/2021
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK
TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS
BY: /s/ Kathy Ballard

P.O. Box 131407
Houston, Texas 77219
Tel. 832-922-4000
Fax 832-922-6262

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing responses to requests for admissions have been duly served on all parties and/or their counsel of record, as listed below, by certified mail, return receipt requested, or via electronic delivery or via email, through e-file notification, in accordance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, on this the 8th day of February, 2016, and a true copy of said notice was promptly filed in the office of the Clerk of Court together with this proof of service.

Harriet Nicholson
2951 Santa Sabina Drive
Grand Prairie, TX 75052

/s/ Kelly J. Harvey



A CERTIFIED COPY
 ATTEST: 09/09/2021
 THOMAS A. WILDER
 DISTRICT CLERK
 TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS
 BY: /s/ Kathy Ballard

CAUSE NO. 048-276347-15

HARRIET NICHOLSON	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT
	§	
V.	§	TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS
	§	
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC	§	48TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S NO-EVIDENCE
 MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

On the 27th day of April 2016 came on to be considered Defendant's No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment.

The Court, having considered the motion, the evidence, and the arguments of Counsel and the Plaintiff, has determined that the motion should be Granted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant's No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED**.

Signed this the 17th day of May 2016.

DAVID L. EVANS, Judge Presiding

cc: Harriet Nicholson
 2951 Santa Sabina Drive
 Grand Prairie, Texas 75052
Via First Class Mail

Kelly J. Harvey
Via Fax No. (832) 922-6262

MAILED COPY TO ALL ATTORNEYS
 AND PRO SE PARTIES OF RECORD
5-19-2016



F-MAIL BOX
5-19-2016

Court's Minutes
 Transaction # 199



CAUSE NO. 048-276347-15

HARRIET NICHOLSON

~ versus ~

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC

§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS

48TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SET STATUS CONFERENCE

On the 5th day of March, 2021 came on to be considered Plaintiff's Motion to Set Status Conference filed on February 23, 2021. A final judgement was signed in this case on May 17, 2016. An appeal of the final judgement was dismissed on August 10, 2016. The mandate of the Court of Appeal issued on November 4, 2016. The appeal was unsuccessful therefor the final judgement was not vacated in whole or in part. The district court lost plenary jurisdiction in this August 30, 2016. This court is without jurisdiction to set a status conference.

The Court, having considered the motion, the evidence, the record of the case and the arguments of the parties, has determined that the motion should be **DENIED for want of jurisdiction.**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the motion is **DENIED for want of jurisdiction.**

Signed this 12th day of March, 2021.

DAVID L. EVANS, JUDGE PRESIDING



A CERTIFIED COPY
ATTEST: 09/09/2021
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK
TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS
BY: /s/ Kathy Ballard

FILED
TARRANT COUNTY
2021 MAR 12 PM 2:35
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK



E-MAILED
3-12-2021

048-276347-15



A CERTIFIED COPY
ATTEST: 09/09/2021
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK
TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS
BY: /s/ Kathy Ballard

FILED
TARRANT COUNTY
3/17/2021 2:45 PM
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK

CAUSE NO. 048-276347-15

HARRIET NICHOLSON,
Plaintiff Counter Defendant,

48th District Court

v.

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC,
Defendant Counter Plaintiff

Tarrant County, Texas

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF APPEAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiff, Harriet Nicholson, and files this timely Notice of Appeal to the Second Court of Appeals of Texas.

1. Plaintiff is appealing the Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Set Status Conference signed on March 12, 2021. (Ex. A)
2. On May 17, 2016, the Court signed an Interlocutory Order Granting Nationstar Mortgage's No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment. (Ex. B)
3. On June 16, 2016, Plaintiff filed a premature appeal of the Interlocutory Order Granting Nationstar Mortgage's No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment to the Second Court of Appeals <https://search.txcourts.gov/Case.aspx?cn=02-16-00210-CV&coa=coa02> that was subsequently transferred to the Eighth Court of Appeals on July 7, 2016. [Nicholson v. Nationstar Mortg., LLC, No. 08-16-00148-CV, 2016 WL 4208100, at *1 \(Tex. App. Aug. 10, 2016\)](#)
4. On July 8, 2016, Kelly Harvey sent a Letter to the 48th District Trial and the Eighth Court of Appeals advising the appeal was premature because Nationstar Mortgage's counterclaim for attorney's fees was pending and she was planning to pursue counterclaim in a summary judgment within thirty days. (Ex. C)

[07.08.16 Kelly Harvey Letter to 48th District Court and Eighth Court of Appeals](#)



CAUSE NO. 048-276347-15

HARRIET NICHOLSON

~ versus ~

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC

§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS

48TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**ORDER VACATING ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
TO SET STATUS CONFERENCE**

On the 21st day of May 2021 came on to be considered the Abatement Order dated April 19, 2021, in No. 02-21-00074-CV, Harriet Nicholson v. NationStar Mortgage, LLC in The Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth.

The Court, having considered the order and the file in this case, is of the opinion that the Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Set Status Conference should be vacated.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Set Status Conference be and is hereby Vacated.

Signed this 21st day of May 2021.

DAVID L. EVANS, JUDGE PRESIDING



A CERTIFIED COPY
ATTEST: 10/28/2021
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK
TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS
BY: /s/ Kathy Ballard

FILED
TARRANT COUNTY
2021 MAY 21 PM 3:05
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK



E-MAILED
5-21-21



FILED
TARRANT COUNTY

2021 JUL 13 PM 1:37

THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK

CAUSE NO. 048-276347-15

HARRIET NICHOLSON,
Plaintiff,

vs.

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC,
Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS

48th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

FINAL JUDGMENT

On December 1, 2015, the Court entered an Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment concerning Plaintiff's declaratory judgment claims (the "December 1, 2015, Order").

On April 27, 2016, Defendant Nationstar Mortgage LLC's Amended No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment and the Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Regarding the Effects [sic] of Rescission Deed (the "Plaintiff's Motion") were heard.

On May 17, 2016, the Court signed an order granting Nationstar's Amended No-Evidence Motion for Summary Judgment disposing of all of Plaintiff's claims, and an order denying the Plaintiff's Motion (the "May 17, 2016, Orders").

On June 16, 2021, Defendant Nationstar Mortgage LLC filed its non-suit of its counterclaim for attorney's fees and costs (the "Non-Suit").

On June 30, 2021, the Court signed its Order Regarding Objections to Summary Judgment Evidence (the "June 30, 2021, Order").

On July 1, 2021, the Court signed its Order Regarding Pending Matters as of June 23, 2021.

On July 13, 2021, the Court signed an Order Regarding Motion for Leave To Set Plaintiff's Cross-Motion For Summary Judgment signed on April 20, 2016.

Page 1 of 2



E-MAILED
7-13-2021



A CERTIFIED COPY
ATTEST: 10/28/2021
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK
TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS
BY: /s/ Kathy Ballard

The December 1, 2015, Order, May 17, 2016, Orders, June 30, 2021, Order, the Order Regarding Pending Matters as of June 23, 2021, and the order of July 13, 2021, entitled "Order Regarding Motion for Leave to Set Plaintiff's Cross-Motion For Summary Judgment" are all incorporated herein.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that Plaintiff shall take nothing on her claims against Defendant Nationstar Mortgage LLC, and said claims are dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that all of Plaintiff's pending motions are DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that Defendant Nationstar Mortgage LLC's Non-Suit is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that this judgment disposes of all claims and parties and is a final appealable judgment.

SIGNED this 13th day of July, 2021. @ 1:15



DAVID L. EVANS, JUDGE PRESIDING

Page 2 of 2



A CERTIFIED COPY
ATTEST: 10/28/2021
THOMAS A. WILDER
DISTRICT CLERK
TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS
BY: /s/ Kathy Ballard

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: 58645462
Status as of 11/1/2021 9:48 AM CST

Associated Case Party: NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Heather Sutton	24072378	hsutton@mcguirewoods.com	10/28/2021 4:32:35 PM	SENT

Associated Case Party: HARRIET NICHOLSON

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Harriet Nicholson		harrietnicholson@yahoo.com	10/28/2021 4:32:35 PM	SENT
Harriet Nicholson		save.my.home.in.2013@gmail.com	10/28/2021 4:32:35 PM	SENT
Harriet Nicholson		nich.district@gmail.com	10/28/2021 4:32:35 PM	SENT