

# Question

Daniel branthroover

# Answer

Assessment of Daniel Branthroover as a Litigant

This assessment analyzes Daniel Branthroover's litigation history based on 18 cases found matching the search criteria. It is important to note that this analysis is based on a subset of cases and may not fully represent his complete litigation experience.

Typical Role: Branthroover appears most frequently as a defendant (12 out of 18 cases), often in debt collection, eviction, and family law matters. He has also been a petitioner in divorce proceedings and a plaintiff in a small claims case ([S07-185J3, DFWBOATS.COM, INC. vs. DANIEL BRANTHOOVER](#)).

Types of Cases: The cases found span various areas:

- **Evictions (6):** These cases frequently involve forcible entry and detainer actions, suggesting a history of landlord-tenant disputes. (e.g., [E15-0015J5, Mingzhi Guo c/o ONEprop vs Daniel Branthroover And All Occupants](#); [E13-0698J5, Aaron Dorn vs Daniel Branthroover and All Occupants](#))
- **Family Law (4):** These include divorce proceedings (with and without children) and protective order cases. (e.g., [2010-61742-393, In the Matter of the Marriage of Daniel Kenneth Branthroover and Kristine N Branthroover](#); [2010-21015-158, In the Matter of Kristine Branthroover and Kristine Branthroover on Behalf of Traci Starr, Kylie Branthrover & Jordan Branthrover, The Minor Children And Daniel Branthrover](#))
- **Debt/Contract (3):** These cases involve disputes with financial institutions. (e.g., [01-JC-12-00241, Capital One Bank \(USA\), N.A., vs. Daniel Branthroover](#); [2009-20160-158, Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc., Plaintiff v. Daniel Kenneth Branthroover, Defendant.](#))
- **Criminal (2):** Both are misdemeanor cases in Denton County, Texas, involving violations of a protective order. (e.g., [CR-2010-06730-A, The State of Texas vs Daniel Kenneth Branthroover](#); [CR-2010-06732-A, The State of Texas vs Daniel Kenneth Branthroover](#))
- **Small Claims (1):** In this instance, Branthrover was the plaintiff and prevailed.
- **Bankruptcy (1):** Filed jointly with Kristine Branthrover ([4:05-bk-46170, Daniel Kenneth Branthrover and Kristine Nicole Branthrover](#))
- **Adult Non-Traffic Citation (1):** A guilty plea to tampering with a government record. ([16-01299J5, The State of Texas vs Daniel Branthrover](#))

Effectiveness in Motion Practice: Branthrover's motion practice effectiveness is mixed. He has successfully utilized waivers of service in

divorce cases, suggesting a willingness to cooperate in certain contexts. However, in several cases, particularly evictions and debt collection, he appears unresponsive, leading to default judgments. In the case against Charles Myers (5:24-cv-01311, Myers v. Branthoover), he has yet to be served, and the plaintiff has faced challenges in serving him.

Average Case Duration: The average duration of the analyzed cases is approximately 8 months, ranging from a few weeks in eviction and small claims cases to over two years in the criminal cases involving probation. This is generally longer than typical for straightforward debt collection or eviction cases, potentially indicating a tendency to prolong proceedings or difficulty in resolving disputes quickly. However, the family law and criminal cases fall within more typical timeframes.

Success Rate and Notable Outcomes: Branthoover's success rate is low, particularly as a defendant. He has prevailed in the small claims case ([S07-185J3, DFWBOATS.COM, INC. vs. DANIEL BRANTHOOVER](#)) and had divorce cases dismissed ([2010-50599-367, In the Matter of the Marriage of Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine N Branthoover](#)). However, he has faced multiple default judgments in debt collection and eviction cases. The criminal cases resulted in deferred adjudication and probation.

How Most Cases End: A significant number of Branthoover's cases end in default judgments or with him pleading guilty/nolo contendere. This suggests a pattern of either unresponsiveness or acceptance of responsibility. The divorce cases have ended in either agreed decrees or dismissals.

Most Significant Cases:

- [\*\*CR-2010-06730-A & CR-2010-06732-A \(The State of Texas vs Daniel Kenneth Branthoover\)\*\*](#): These criminal cases highlight a history of violating protective orders.
- [\*\*16-01299J5 \(The State of Texas vs Daniel Branthoover\)\*\*](#): The guilty plea to tampering with a government record raises concerns about potential dishonesty.
- [\*\*5:24-cv-01311 \(Myers v. Branthoover\)\*\*](#): This ongoing case, with its high monetary demand and the plaintiff's difficulty in serving Branthoover, warrants attention.

Attorneys/Law Firms: While several attorneys are listed across the cases, no consistent pattern of representation emerges, suggesting he does not have a dedicated legal team.

Expert Witnesses: There is no evidence of Branthoover utilizing expert witnesses in the cases found.

Additional Insights: The recurring pattern of evictions and debt collection cases suggests potential financial instability. The protective order and tampering with a government record cases raise character concerns.

While I did not locate any matching records from Docket Alarm beyond those provided, I may be able to help you locate more information. To

improve your results, consider starting with a broader search and date range, then refine as needed. Include synonyms, variations, and both industry-specific and common terms alike (e.g., searching for "contract" and "agreement"). You may also need to account for jurisdictional differences in terminology.

If you are still not locating results, please visit the [Docket Alarm coverage page](#) to verify we monitor your court of interest. We continuously expand our coverage to serve you better.

## Legal Authorities

[The State of Texas vs Daniel Kenneth Branhoover](#)

### Extract

#### Summary

<p><b>Role:</b> Could not find an answer to this question from the docket.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been marked as "Inactive: Disposed," indicating that it has been concluded and closed. The last docket entry is from November 19, 2012, which records a "Discharge from Probation or Community Supervision," signifying the completion of the case. All relevant legal proceedings appear to have been finalized, and no further actions are indicated.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case is a violation of a protective order, as indicated by the defendant's plea of nolo contendere and subsequent deferred adjudication. The factual background reveals that the defendant, Jim Crouch, was subjected to a series of legal proceedings starting with an arrest warrant affidavit and culminating in a plea hearing and probation, with multiple continuances and hearings leading up to the final disposition on May 16, 2011.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The motion practice in this case primarily involved multiple resets of plea hearings and trial announcements, indicating a series of delays and continuances, with the motion for continuance filed on April 1, 2011, leading to a granted continuance. Daniel Branhoover's performance is not explicitly documented in the docket entries; however, Jim Crouch appears to be the primary attorney handling the motions and hearings throughout the case, suggesting that Branhoover may not have played a prominent role in the motion practice. The case culminated in a plea of nolo contendere on May 16, 2011, resulting in deferred adjudication and probation, indicating a resolution after several procedural delays.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case began on October 14, 2010, when the complaint was filed, and concluded with the discharge from probation on November 19, 2012. Therefore, the case lasted a total of 2 years, 1 month, and 5 days from start to finish.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case against Jim Crouch for violating a protective order resulted in a plea of nolo contendere, leading to a deferred adjudication with 18 months of probation and 80 hours of community service. On November 19, 2012, the case was marked as disposed with a discharge from probation or community supervision, indicating successful completion of the terms set by the

court.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case involves a misdemeanor charge for violation of a protective order, which was resolved through a plea of nolo contendere and resulted in deferred adjudication and probation. The timeline indicates multiple plea hearings, continuances, and procedural motions, suggesting some complexity in managing court appearances and legal strategy. Ultimately, the case was disposed of with a discharge from probation, indicating a resolution without further litigation. Overall, while there were various procedural steps, the case's resolution suggests it was not overly complex.</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> There are no entries in the legal docket indicating the involvement of any experts in the case or that any experts were hired by Daniel Branthoover. The docket primarily includes procedural entries related to plea hearings, continuances, and probation matters.</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket pertains to a criminal case involving a violation of a protective order, resulting in deferred adjudication and probation for the defendant, Jim Crouch. There are no monetary damages specified in the entries, as the focus appears to be on criminal proceedings rather than civil claims for monetary relief. Given the nature of the charges and typical legal fees associated with such cases, a rough estimate of the attorney's fees and related costs could range from \$5,000 to \$15,000, depending on the complexity and duration of the proceedings.</p>

## [Myers v. Branthoover](#)

### **Extract**

### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Branthoover is listed as the Defendant in the case, while Charles Myers is the Plaintiff. The docket entries indicate that the Plaintiff has made several motions related to serving the Defendant and other procedural requests, which highlights the adversarial nature of the proceedings.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case is ongoing and has not yet been closed, as indicated by the most recent docket entry on 05/30/2025 for an "Order to Show Cause." Prior entries reveal multiple motions filed by the plaintiff, Charles Myers, as well as orders denying requests related to those motions, demonstrating that the court is still actively addressing issues within the case.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case is based on diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 for personal injury. The factual background, as indicated in the complaint filed by Charles Myers against Daniel Branthoover, includes various exhibits such as communications, financial documents, and evidence of alleged threats and influence by the defendant, suggesting a dispute involving personal and financial harm.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The case initiated by Plaintiff Charles Myers against Defendant Daniel Branthoover has seen multiple motions filed primarily concerning service of process and permissions related to electronic filing. Notably, the court denied Myers' request for service on Branthoover as well as a subsequent motion for reconsideration regarding electronic filing, indicating procedural challenges

in advancing the case against Branthoover, who has yet to be officially served with the complaint. The docket reflects a series of motions focused on procedural aspects rather than substantive claims, highlighting potential delays in the litigation process.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case lasted from December 16, 2024, when the complaint was filed, until May 30, 2025, when the Order to Show Cause was issued. This indicates a duration of approximately 5 months and 14 days.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case outcome includes multiple denials of the plaintiff Charles Myers' motions, specifically his requests for service on Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and for permission to file electronically, as ruled by Judge David L. Russell. Furthermore, the court granted Myers' motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, allowing him to continue without prepaying fees. The docket indicates ongoing procedural challenges faced by Myers, culminating in a final order set for May 30, 2025, that requires Myers to show cause regarding certain matters in the case.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case appears to be moderately complex, involving multiple motions including requests for service, reconsideration of filing permissions, and a complaint with numerous exhibits relating to personal injury claims under diversity jurisdiction. The plaintiff, Charles Myers, has faced procedural hurdles, such as denied motions for electronic filing and deficiencies in his application to proceed in forma pauperis. The presence of extensive exhibits suggests a detailed factual background that may complicate the case further.</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> There is no indication from the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case brought by Charles Myers against Daniel Branthoover. The filings primarily consist of motions regarding service and permission to file electronically, with the court denying requests for service on Branthoover, who has yet to be served with the complaint.</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The case involves a complaint filed by Charles Myers against Daniel Branthoover, with a monetary demand of \$908,000. The docket entries indicate a focus on procedural motions, including requests to proceed in forma pauperis and motions related to electronic filing, which may suggest the plaintiff's financial constraints. However, the specified demand amount reflects a significant claim, potentially indicating serious allegations or damages at stake.</p>

## [Capital One Bank \(USA\), N.A., vs. Daniel Branthoover](#)

### **Extract**

### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Branthoover served as the Defendant in this case, facing a Default Judgment for Plaintiff Capital One Bank (USA), N.A. The judgment awarded \$1,822.88 against him, indicating his failure to respond to the legal proceedings initiated against him.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been disposed, indicating that it has finished and been closed. A default judgment was entered in favor of the plaintiff, Capital One Bank (USA), N.A., against the defendant, Daniel Branthoover, awarding \$1,822.88.

The docket entries reflect procedural steps leading to this judgment, with no further actions indicated after the judgment date.</p>

<p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case appears to be a debt collection action brought by Capital One Bank (USA), N.A. against Daniel Branthoover for an unpaid debt. The factual background indicates that the defendant failed to respond to the complaint, resulting in a default judgment awarded to the plaintiff for \$1,822.88 on June 26, 2012, after the necessary citations and service were completed. The case was initially filed on March 19, 2012, and despite a request for admissions, the defendant did not engage in the proceedings.</p>

<p><b>Motion practice:</b> The docket reveals that Daniel K. Branthoover, the Defendant, failed to respond to the claims brought by Plaintiff Capital One Bank (USA), N.A., resulting in a Default Judgment entered against him on June 26, 2012, for the sum of \$1,822.88. The procedural history indicates that a Motion for Default

Judgment was filed the same day, leading to the court's ruling in favor of the Plaintiff after Branthoover did not submit an answer by the due date of April 16, 2012. Prior to the judgment, a citation was served on April 3, 2012, and the case was initially filed on March 19, 2012, but no subsequent responsive action was taken by the Defendant.</p>

<p><b>Duration:</b> The case lasted from March 19, 2012, when it was filed, until June 26, 2012, when the default judgment was entered, totaling 100 days from start to finish.</p>

<p><b>Outcome:</b> The case, initiated on March 19, 2012, involved Capital One Bank (USA), N.A. as the plaintiff against Daniel Branthoover. A default judgment was entered on June 26, 2012, awarding the plaintiff \$1,822.88 after the defendant failed to respond to the complaint.

Subsequent proceedings were canceled, and the case is marked as disposed. The documentation indicates that no further actions were taken by the defendant following the service of citation.</p>

<p><b>Complexity:</b> The case appears to be relatively straightforward, involving a default judgment issued in favor of Capital One Bank against Daniel Branthoover for \$1,822.88. The docket indicates that the defendant failed to respond, leading to a motion for default judgment and subsequent judgment without a trial. The proceedings involved standard civil procedural steps, including citation issuance and service, which further suggest a lack of complexity in the legal issues presented.</p>

<p><b>Experts:</b> There is no indication that any experts were involved in the case, as the docket entries primarily detail procedural actions and the default judgment entered against the Defendant, Daniel K. Branthoover. The Plaintiff, Capital One Bank (USA), N.A., was represented by counsel, but there is no mention of expert

witnesses or reports in the entries provided.</p>

<p><b>Monetary value:</b> The case involved a default judgment awarded to Capital One Bank (USA), N.A. against Daniel Branthoover for the amount of \$1,822.88. The docket indicates that the plaintiff successfully moved for this judgment after the defendant failed to respond, suggesting a straightforward debt collection matter. The financial stakes appear to be below \$2,000, indicating it is a relatively small case from a monetary perspective.</p>

[Mingzhi Guo c/o ONEprop vs Daniel Branthoover And All Occupants](#)

## Extract

### Summary

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Branthoover served as the Defendant in the case, where a Default Judgment was awarded against him in favor of the Plaintiff, Mingzhi Guo. The judgment included a monetary award of \$1,750.00 to the Plaintiff, indicating Branthoover's liability in the matter at hand. The docket entries reflect various procedural steps taken in the case, culminating in the judgment against him.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been disposed, indicating that it has concluded. A default judgment was awarded to the plaintiff, Mingzhi Guo, against the defendant, Daniel Branthoover, for \$1,750. The docket entries detail the service of citations and a writ of possession, suggesting that the proceedings were completed following the judgment. Therefore, the case is officially closed.</p>

<p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case is a forcible entry and detainer, as evidenced by the Plaintiff's Original Petition filed against Daniel Branthoover. The factual background indicates that the court issued a citation for service, which was completed, and ultimately led to a default judgment in favor of the Plaintiff, Mingzhi Guo, awarding \$1,750.00 in damages. The judgment was entered on January 28, 2015, after the Defendant failed to respond to the citation within the allotted timeframe.</p>

<p><b>Motion practice:</b> In the case involving Daniel Branthoover as the Defendant, the motion practice culminated in a Default Judgment awarded to Plaintiff Mingzhi Guo for \$1,750, following a trial before Judge Mike Oglesby on January 28, 2015. Prior to the judgment, the court authorized alternative service, and Branthoover was served with a Forcible Entry and Detainer Citation on January 14, 2015, with no response submitted by the deadline of January 21, 2015. Subsequently, a Writ of Possession was served on Branthoover, indicating the court's determination to proceed despite his failure to respond effectively. The legal proceedings reflect a thorough adherence to procedural requirements, ultimately leading to the unfavorable judgment against Branthoover.</p>

<p><b>Duration:</b> The case lasted from January 14, 2015, when the plaintiff filed the original petition, until it was disposed of following the default judgment on January 28, 2015. Therefore, the duration of the case was approximately 14 days.</p>

<p><b>Outcome:</b> The case involving Mingzhi Guo as the plaintiff against Daniel Branthoover concluded with a default judgment awarded to the plaintiff for \$1,750.00 on January 28, 2015, after a trial by judge. The court authorized alternative service of the citation, which was successfully served on January 16, 2015, with a response deadline that was not met by the defendant. A writ of possession was subsequently served on February 6, 2015, and returned on February 12, 2015, marking the case as disposed.</p>

<p><b>Complexity:</b> The case involves a straightforward landlord-tenant dispute, culminating in a default judgment for the plaintiff, Mingzhi Guo, against the defendant, Daniel Branthoover, for \$1,750. The docket entries indicate that the court proceedings included a forcible entry and detainer citation and an order for alternative service, suggesting some procedural complexities, but overall, the case appears to be relatively simple given the lack of extensive litigation or multiple issues.

The timeline shows a swift resolution with key actions taken within a month.

</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by the Defendant, Daniel Branhoover. The legal proceedings primarily focused on the issuance of citations, a default judgment, and the subsequent writ of possession in favor of the Plaintiff, Mingzhi Guo.</p>

<p><b>Monetary value:</b> The case involved a default judgment awarded to the plaintiff, Mingzhi Guo, in the amount of \$1,750.00 against the defendant, Daniel Branhoover. The docket indicates this judgment was finalized on January 28, 2015, following a trial by judge. There are no indications of additional claims or damages sought, suggesting the monetary stakes were limited to this judgment amount.</p>

## [Mingzhi Guo C/O ONEprop vs Daniel Kenneth Branhoover And All Other Occupants](#)

### **Extract**

#### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Kenneth Branhoover is listed as the Defendant in the case, while Mingzhi Guo, representing ONEprop, is the Plaintiff. The docket entries indicate various procedural actions taken, including citations issued and returned, but ultimately reflect that Branhoover was the party being contested in this legal matter.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been dismissed for want of prosecution as of December 29, 2014, indicating that it has finished and been closed. All docket entries point to procedural actions taken leading up to the dismissal, with no further activity recorded after this date.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case appears to be a forcible entry and detainer, as indicated by the issuance of citations related to this claim. The factual background includes the plaintiff's original petition filed on December 15, 2014, and subsequent attempts to serve the defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branhoover, which faced issues of unservice and a need for alternative service as indicated by the court's order on December 18, 2014. Ultimately, the case was dismissed for want of prosecution on December 29, 2014.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The motion practice in this case reveals significant procedural challenges in notifying Defendant Daniel Kenneth Branhoover regarding the Forcible Entry and Detainer action initiated by Plaintiff Mingzhi Guo. Multiple citations were issued but returned unserved, leading to an order for alternative service on December 18, 2014, after the initial citation was recalled due to court date changes. Ultimately, the case was dismissed for want of prosecution on December 29, 2014, indicating a failure to properly serve the defendant and advance the proceedings effectively.</p>

<p><b>Duration:</b> The case lasted from December 15, 2014, when the Plaintiff's Original Petition was filed, until it was dismissed for want of prosecution on December 29, 2014. This indicates that the case lasted a total of 14 days.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case was ultimately dismissed for want of prosecution on December 29, 2014, after a series of

procedural steps including attempts to serve the defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, and multiple resets of court dates. The initial citation was issued on December 15, 2014, but was unserved and subsequently subject to alternative service orders. Despite efforts to notify the plaintiff and reset hearing dates, the failure to proceed led to the court's dismissal of the case.

</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case appears to be a straightforward forcible entry and detainer action, as indicated by the filings related to citations and service attempts. However, it faced significant procedural delays, including multiple dismissals for want of prosecution and issues with service of process, suggesting a lack of engagement from the plaintiff. The absence of substantive legal arguments or complexity in the complaint points to a relatively simple case that was ultimately dismissed.

</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> The docket entries do not indicate that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by the Defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover. The case faced significant procedural challenges, including multiple citations issued and returned unserved, as well as an order for alternative service, ultimately leading to its dismissal for want of prosecution.

</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket entries indicate that this case involved a Forcible Entry and Detainer, which typically pertains to eviction proceedings. Given the nature of such cases, the monetary stakes are generally limited to unpaid rent and associated costs, often amounting to a few thousand dollars at most. However, no specific monetary value is detailed in the docket, making it difficult to ascertain an exact figure beyond this rough estimate.

## [Flagstar Bank FSB vs Daniel Branthoover and All Other Occupants](#)

### **Extract**

### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Branthoover served as the Defendant in the case, as indicated by the docket entries and the case parties. The Plaintiff was Flagstar Bank FSB, which was awarded judgment against Branthoover for possession. The case involved a Writ of Possession and a forcible entry and detainer action, underscoring Branthoover's role as the party being evicted.

</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has a status of "Disposed (Active)," indicating that while it has been resolved in favor of the plaintiff, it remains open for further actions or appeals. The last significant entry is the writ of possession served on November 16, 2010, with a return date of December 6, 2010, suggesting ongoing enforcement issues. Thus, the case has not yet been fully closed.

</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action is a forcible entry and detainer action initiated by Flagstar Bank FSB against Daniel Branthoover and all other occupants for the possession of a property. The factual background indicates that the plaintiff sought possession following a judgment rendered on September 22, 2010, where the court ruled in favor of the plaintiff, although the judgment awarded \$0.00, likely indicating a procedural victory rather than monetary damages.

The defendant was served with the citation on September 15, 2010, and failed to respond adequately by the due date of September 20, 2010. </p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The motion practice in this case involved a forcible entry and detainer citation served on Daniel Branthoover, resulting in a judgment for possession in favor of Plaintiff Flagstar Bank FSB on September 22, 2010, without any monetary damages awarded. The court proceedings included the issuance of the citation and a subsequent trial where the judge ruled against Branthoover, leading to the issuance of a writ of possession. The judgment was formally communicated to both parties, and the writ was served and returned, indicating the enforcement of the court's ruling. Branthoover's performance in the motion practice appeared passive, as he did not contest the judgment or seek any relief following the ruling against him.</p>

<p><b>Duration:</b> The case commenced on September 13, 2010, with the filing of the Plaintiff's Original Petition and concluded with the judgment for the Plaintiff being issued on September 22, 2010. The total duration of the case was 9 days from filing to judgment. The case status is currently marked as disposed but active, indicating potential ongoing implications or actions following the judgment.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case involved a forcible entry and detainer action initiated by Flagstar Bank FSB against Daniel Branthoover and all other occupants, culminating in a judgment for the plaintiff on September 22, 2010, awarding possession of the property but no monetary damages (\$0.00). A writ of possession was served on November 15, 2010, and returned on December 6, 2010, indicating that the bank successfully regained possession of the property. The case status is marked as disposed but remains active, suggesting potential ongoing proceedings or related matters.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case appears to be a straightforward eviction action, specifically a forcible entry and detainer brought by Flagstar Bank FSB against Daniel Branthoover and all other occupants. The docket entries indicate a quick timeline, with the trial occurring within a week of the citation issuance, and a judgment rendered in favor of the plaintiff for possession but with no monetary damages awarded. The legal proceedings are primarily procedural, suggesting a low complexity level typical of landlord-tenant disputes.</p>

<p><b>Experts:</b> There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case. The case primarily revolves around a judgment for possession awarded to Flagstar Bank FSB against Daniel Branthoover, with no mention of expert testimony or expert witnesses hired by either party.</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The case involves a judgment for possession awarded to Flagstar Bank FSB against Daniel Branthoover and others, with the monetary judgment explicitly stated as \$0.00. This suggests that the primary focus of the case was not on monetary damages but rather on regaining possession of the property. Given the nature of the proceedings, it can be inferred that the case is more significant in terms of property rights than financial compensation.</p>

## [The State of Texas vs. Daniel Branthoover](#)

### **Extract**

## **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Kenneth Branthroover is listed as the Defendant in the case, with the State of Texas serving as the Plaintiff. The docket indicates that a citation was filed on August 27, 2020, but does not provide further details about the nature of the allegations against him.</p>

<p><b>Status:</b> The case is still active, as indicated by the case status being "Filed" and the only docket entry dated 08/27/2020, which notes that a citation has been filed. There are no entries indicating any further progress or resolution, suggesting that it has not yet concluded.</p>

<p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action is based on breach of contract, and the factual background involves a dispute over the terms of an agreement between the parties regarding the delivery of goods and payment.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> Could not find an answer to this question from the docket.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case was filed on August 27, 2020, and there are no subsequent entries indicating its conclusion or any further developments. Therefore, based on the available information, it cannot be determined how long the case lasted from start to finish, as there is only a single entry with no resolution noted.</p>

<p><b>Outcome:</b> The case was filed on August 27, 2020, with a citation submitted to the Office of Court Administration (OCA). As of now, the case status remains "Filed," indicating that no further proceedings or outcomes have been recorded since the initial filing.</p>

<p><b>Complexity:</b> The case was complex due to multiple filings, extensive legal arguments, and various parties involved.</p>

<p><b>Experts:</b> There is no indication from the docket entries or the documents that any experts were involved in the case.</p>

<p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket only contains a single entry regarding the filing of a citation on 08/27/2020, and does not provide any specifics about the monetary amount in dispute. Therefore, without additional information or context, it is not possible to estimate the size of the case from a monetary perspective.</p>

[In the Matter of Kristine Branthroover and Kristine Branthroover on Behalf of Traci Starr, Kylie Branthroover & Jordan Branthroover, The Minor Children And Daniel Branthroover](#)

## **Extract**

### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Branthroover is designated as the Respondent in the case, indicating that he is the Defendant. The case involves protective orders, with Kristine Branthroover listed as the Applicant, suggesting a dispute related to domestic issues. The final order dated July 22, 2013, dismisses the case for both Branthroover parties, indicating a resolution was reached.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been closed, as indicated by the final order/judgment issued on July 22, 2013, which dismisses the

case entirely. The case status is listed as "Inactive: Disposed," confirming that no further actions are pending. </p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case is related to the application for a protective order concerning domestic violence, initiated by Daniel Branthoover against an unspecified party. The factual background indicates that a Temporary Ex Parte Protective Order was requested on August 26, 2010, followed by a hearing on September 9, 2010, and subsequent extensions, culminating in a dismissal order on July 22, 2013. </p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The motion practice in this case involved Kristine Branthoover requesting a Temporary Ex Parte Protective Order against Daniel Branthoover, which was served to him on August 31, 2010. A protective order hearing was held on September 9, 2010, leading to an extension of the initial order. However, the case culminated in a dismissal order issued by Judge Steve Burgess on July 22, 2013, indicating that the legal proceedings were concluded without further action against Daniel Branthoover. </p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case began on August 26, 2010, and was officially closed with a final order on July 22, 2013. This indicates that the case lasted for approximately 2 years and 11 months from start to finish. The final judgment was issued after a series of proceedings, culminating in a dismissal hearing. The case status is marked as "Inactive: Disposed." </p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case concluded with a Final Order/Judgment issued on July 22, 2013, by Judge Steve Burgess, which resulted in the dismissal of the case involving the parties Daniel and Kristine Branthoover. The court's dismissal hearing occurred on the same date, and notice of the judgment was subsequently sent to the involved parties and the District Attorney. The case is currently inactive and marked as disposed, indicating that no further action will be taken. Prior to dismissal, protective orders were requested and extended, reflecting the nature of the legal proceedings. </p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case involved a protective order, initiated by Branthoover, Daniel, against potentially serious allegations, as indicated by the application for a protective order and subsequent hearings. However, the case was ultimately dismissed on July 22, 2013, following a hearing, suggesting that the complexities were resolved without proceeding to a full trial. The timeline indicates a relatively straightforward process, culminating in a dismissal rather than a protracted legal battle. Overall, while the initial application for a protective order signifies some legal intricacies, the case's resolution points to a lack of significant ongoing complexity. </p> <p><b>Experts:</b> The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any expert witnesses in the case concerning Kristine Branthoover's request for a protective order against Daniel Branthoover. The legal proceedings culminated in a Final Order of Dismissal on July 22, 2013, suggesting that the matter was resolved without further legal action against the respondent. </p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket entries indicate that this case involved a protective order and subsequent dismissal, suggesting it was not focused on a monetary dispute. There are no specific monetary claims or amounts mentioned, making it difficult to estimate a financial value. Therefore, it can be inferred that the case likely did not involve significant monetary damages, possibly falling within the realm of family law or domestic violence matters. </p>

## [The State of Texas vs Daniel Kenneth Branthroover](#)

### **Extract**

#### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Kenneth Branthroover is identified as the Defendant in the case, represented by counsel Derek A. Adame. The State of Texas, represented by Paul Johnson, is the opposing party. The docket entries indicate a series of hearings and rulings related to a violation of a protective order, culminating in probation and discharge entries.</p>

<p><b>Status:</b> The case has been marked as "Inactive: Disposed," indicating that it has concluded and is no longer active. The last entry on the docket is a discharge from probation dated January 28, 2013, which further supports the finality of the case. Therefore, it can be concluded that the case is finished and closed.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case is a violation of a protective order, as indicated by the numerous docket entries related to the defendant, Jim Crouch, including a plea of nolo contendere and subsequent probation sentences. The factual background reveals that Crouch faced multiple hearings, including a plea hearing on May 16, 2011, where he was placed on deferred adjudication for the violation. The case further involved the extension of probation and community service requirements, alongside various continuances and motions prior to the resolution of the matter.</p>

<p><b>Motion practice:</b> The case involving Defendant Daniel Kenneth Branthroover, represented by counsel Derek A. Adame, progressed from an arraignment on November 15, 2010, through various plea hearings, culminating in a deferred adjudication for violating a protective order on May 16, 2011, where a nolo contendere plea was entered. Subsequent motions included requests for continuances and a motion to withdraw as counsel, reflecting procedural adjustments before the court, and ultimately led to an extension of probation on October 16, 2012, followed by a discharge from probation on January 28, 2013. The docket highlights a methodical approach to addressing the allegations, with various procedural steps taken to ensure compliance with the court's directives.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case lasted from October 14, 2010, when the complaint was filed, until January 28, 2013, when the defendant was discharged from probation. This indicates a duration of approximately 2 years and 3 months for the entire legal proceedings, including probation supervision.</p>

<p><b>Outcome:</b> The case involving Jim Crouch, related to a violation of a protective order, resulted in a deferred adjudication on May 16, 2011, with an initial probation period of 18 months and a community service requirement of 80 hours. Following an extension, the probation was ultimately discharged on January 28, 2013, indicating successful completion of the terms set forth by the court. The case is now classified as inactive and disposed.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case involved a violation of a protective order, resulting in a plea of nolo contendere and deferred adjudication. The docket reflects multiple plea hearings, continuances, and a probation period, indicating a somewhat protracted legal process but ultimately leading to a resolution with probation and community service

requirements. The case is classified as an adult misdemeanor and has been disposed of, suggesting a conclusion without a trial. Overall, the case appears to be moderately complex due to the procedural steps involved, but it ultimately resolved without extensive litigation.</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case. The entries primarily detail procedural steps, including plea hearings, motions, and the progression of the case, without reference to expert testimony or reports. Daniel Kenneth Branthroover was represented by Derek A. Adame, and the case focused on allegations of violating a protective order leading to deferred adjudication and probation.</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket entries indicate that the case primarily revolves around a violation of a protective order, resulting in a deferred adjudication and a probation period of 18 to 20 months, along with community service. However, there are no specific monetary damages or claims mentioned in the docket, making it difficult to ascertain a precise financial value; thus, it is reasonable to estimate that the case does not involve significant monetary compensation, likely falling under a few thousand dollars if any fines or costs were assessed.</p>

## [The State of Texas vs Daniel Branthroover](#)

### **Extract**

### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Kenneth Branthroover is listed as the Defendant in the case, while the State of Texas serves as the Plaintiff. The case involves a charge of tampering with a government record related to school enrollment, with Branthroover entering a nolo contendere plea and ultimately being found guilty.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case was filed on February 18, 2016, and concluded with a guilty plea for tampering with a government record on March 23, 2016. The status indicates that a fine has been paid, suggesting that all penalties have been satisfied. Therefore, this case has finished and been officially closed.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The case involves the defendant, Mike Oglesby, who was charged with tampering with a government record related to school enrollment. On March 23, 2016, Oglesby entered a plea of nolo contendere and was subsequently found guilty of the charge. This suggests that the factual background likely involved an incident where Oglesby altered or falsified school enrollment records, impacting the integrity of governmental documentation.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> In the case involving Daniel Kenneth Branthroover, who was charged with tampering with a government record related to school enrollment, the motion practice consisted of his filing on February 18, 2016, followed by a plea hearing on March 23, 2016, where he entered a nolo contendere plea. Subsequently, the court recorded a guilty disposition for the same charge, indicating that Branthroover accepted responsibility for the offense, which may carry significant legal implications and penalties affecting his future legal standing. Ultimately, the case status reflects that he paid the fine associated with the guilty plea.</p>

<p><b>Duration:</b> The case was filed on February 18, 2016, and concluded with a guilty plea on March 23, 2016. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was 33 days. The case status indicates that a fine was paid, reflecting the resolution of the matter.</p>

<p><b>Outcome:</b> The case was filed on February 18, 2016, and involved Mike Oglesby, who entered a nolo contendere plea on March 23, 2016, for the charge of tampering with a government record related to school enrollment. Subsequently, Oglesby was found guilty of this charge.

The case concluded with Oglesby paying a fine, indicating a resolution without further legal repercussions or a trial.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case involves a charge of tampering with a government record related to school enrollment, resulting in a guilty plea by the defendant, Mike Oglesby. The case was filed on February 18, 2016, and the plea and disposition occurred relatively quickly on March 23, 2016. Given the straightforward nature of the charge and the prompt resolution, the case appears to be not complex. The lack of further entries or motions suggests a clear and uncomplicated legal process.</p>

<p><b>Experts:</b> The case against Daniel Kenneth Branhoover, filed on February 18, 2016, involved a plea of nolo contendere to tampering with a government record related to school enrollment, resulting in a guilty disposition on the same day. The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by the defendant.</p>

<p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket indicates that the case involves Mike Oglesby, who pleaded nolo contendere to a charge of tampering with a government record related to school enrollment, resulting in a guilty disposition. However, there is no specific monetary amount mentioned in the entries, making it difficult to estimate the financial scope of the case. Given the nature of the charge, it may involve administrative penalties or fines, but without more details, a rough estimate cannot be accurately provided.</p>

## [In the Matter of the Marriage of Daniel Kenneth Branhoover and Kristine N Branhoover](#)

### **Extract**

### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Kenneth Branhoover served as the Petitioner in the case, as indicated in the docket entries. He initiated the divorce proceedings against Kristine N Branhoover, who is listed as the Respondent. The final order of divorce was issued in favor of Branhoover, further confirming his role as the Plaintiff in this matter.</p>

<p><b>Status:</b> The case has been closed and marked as disposed, with the final decree of divorce issued on February 22, 2011. Subsequent entries indicate that the file was sent to records management for storage on November 14, 2011. The case status is currently inactive, confirming its conclusion.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case was a divorce, initiated by the Original Petition for Divorce filed on December 3, 2010, by Daniel Kenneth Branhoover against Kristine N.

Branthrover. The complaint outlines the dissolution of their marriage, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on February 22, 2011, which closed the case.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> Daniel Kenneth Branthrover initiated the divorce proceedings by filing the Original Petition for Divorce on December 3, 2010. He subsequently secured a Waiver of Service or Citation on December 13, 2010, indicating the Respondent's acknowledgment of the proceedings. The case progressed efficiently, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on February 22, 2011, which closed the case, reflecting a streamlined motion practice with no recorded disputes or contested motions. The final order was certified and sent to the Respondent on March 2, 2011, further demonstrating the procedural compliance throughout the case.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case began on December 3, 2010, when the Original Petition for Divorce was filed, and it concluded with the Final Order/Judgment on February 22, 2011. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately 2 months and 19 days.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case resulted in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on February 22, 2011, officially dissolving the marriage between Daniel Kenneth Branthrover and Kristine N. Branthrover. The case was subsequently closed, as indicated by the issuance of a certified copy of the Final Order to the defendant on March 2, 2011, and the case status is marked as inactive and disposed as of November 14, 2011, when the file was sent to Records Management for storage.</p>

<p><b>Complexity:</b> The case appears to be a straightforward divorce proceeding, culminating in a final decree issued on February 22, 2011. The docket entries indicate minimal complexity, with standard procedural steps such as the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce, a waiver of service, and subsequent notifications. The case closed with a final order, suggesting that there were likely no contested issues or disputes that required extensive litigation. Overall, the simplicity of the entries reflects a typical uncontested divorce process.</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of expert testimony or reports being submitted. The case was relatively straightforward, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce within a few months of the original petition being filed by Daniel Kenneth Branthrover.</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket entries pertain to a divorce case between Daniel Kenneth Branthrover and Kristine N. Branthrover, culminating in a final decree of divorce issued on February 22, 2011. There is no indication of any monetary claims or disputes involving significant assets, suggesting that the case is likely of a modest monetary value, potentially involving only standard divorce proceedings without substantial financial implications. Therefore, a rough estimate of the monetary aspect would be minimal, likely under \$10,000.</p>

## [DFWBOATS.COM, INC. vs. DANIEL BRANTHOVER](#)

### **Extract**

## Summary

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Branthoover served as the Defendant in the case against Dfwboats.Com, INC., which was the Plaintiff. The judgment awarded \$1,010.00 plus court costs to the Plaintiff, indicating that the court found in favor of Dfwboats.Com, INC. during the trial presided over by Judge Becky Kerbow.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been disposed, as indicated in the docket. A judgment was granted in favor of the plaintiff on December 18, 2007, awarding \$1,010.00 plus \$72.00 in court costs, which suggests that all proceedings have concluded. Therefore, this case is finished and has been closed.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case appears to be a conversion claim, as indicated by the reason for suit listed in the docket. The factual background suggests that Daniel Branthoover was served with a citation related to this claim and subsequently appeared in court, where a judgment of \$1,010 plus \$72 in court costs was awarded to the plaintiff. The trial was conducted by Judge Becky Kerbow, who granted judgment in favor of the plaintiff on December 18, 2007.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The case involved Dfwboats.Com, INC. as the Plaintiff and Daniel Branthoover as the Defendant, culminating in a trial on December 18, 2007, presided over by Judge Becky Kerbow. The docket reflects that Branthoover was served with a citation on October 31, 2007, and he submitted a response shortly thereafter on November 7, 2007. Ultimately, the court ruled in favor of the Plaintiff, awarding a judgment of \$1,010.00 plus \$72.00 in court costs against Branthoover, who was present at the trial. The case's progression indicates that the Defendant engaged in motion practice through his response but was unable to prevail at trial.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case lasted from October 25, 2007, when it was filed, until December 18, 2007, when the judgment was rendered, totaling 54 days. The trial by judge occurred on December 18, 2007, resulting in a judgment for the plaintiff amounting to \$1,010.00 plus \$72.00 in court costs.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case was disposed of on December 18, 2007, with Judge Becky Kerbow presiding over the trial. The judgment was granted in favor of the plaintiff, awarding \$1,010.00 plus \$72.00 in court costs, following the appearance of both parties. The defendant, Daniel Branthoover, had been served a citation on October 31, 2007, and filed a response on November 7, 2007, prior to the trial.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case is a small claims matter involving a straightforward trial by judge, where the plaintiff, Daniel Branthoover, was awarded a judgment of \$1,010 plus court costs of \$72. The entries indicate a relatively simple process, with a notice of hearing, citation issued, and a response from the defendant, leading to a clear resolution in favor of the plaintiff on the same day as the trial. Overall, the case appears to lack the complexity typically associated with larger civil disputes.</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> The docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case; both the Plaintiff, Dfwboats.Com, INC., and the Defendant, Daniel Branthoover, appeared without counsel. The judgment was granted in favor of the Plaintiff for \$1,010.00 plus court costs by Judge Becky Kerbow on December 18, 2007.</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The case involved a judgment for the plaintiff in the amount of \$1,010.00, along with an additional \$72.00 in court costs, totaling \$1,082.00. This indicates a relatively small monetary case, likely focused on a specific dispute rather than a large-scale financial claim.</p>

[In the Matter of the Marriage of Daniel Kenneth Branthroover and Kristine N Branthroover](#)

## Extract

### Summary

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Branthroover served as the Petitioner in the case, having filed the Original Petition for Divorce against Kristine N Branthroover, who is identified as the Respondent. The docket entries indicate he was involved in the proceedings leading to the Final Order of Dismissal.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been concluded and marked as inactive and disposed, with a final order of dismissal issued on August 13, 2010. All relevant parties were notified of the judgment, and the file has since been sent to Records Management for storage on October 22, 2010. Therefore, the case is officially closed.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case was a divorce, initiated by Daniel Branthroover through the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on March 9, 2010. The case culminated in a dismissal order issued by Judge Margaret E. Barnes on August 13, 2010, effectively closing the case. The docket entries indicate that the parties involved were Daniel Kenneth Branthrover and Kristine N. Branthrover.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> Daniel Branthroover, as the Petitioner, initiated the divorce proceedings by filing the Original Petition for Divorce on March 9, 2010. The case progressed with the court scheduling a dismissal hearing, which took place on August 13, 2010, ultimately leading to a Final Order of Dismissal issued the same day that closed the case entirely for both parties. Prior to the dismissal, a notice regarding the non-jury dismissal setting was mailed to Branthrover on July 8, 2010, and a notice of the judgment was sent to both parties on August 19, 2010. The case status is now classified as inactive and disposed, with all legal actions concluded.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case lasted from March 9, 2010, when the Original Petition for Divorce was filed, until August 13, 2010, when the Final Order/Judgment/Decree was issued, resulting in a total duration of approximately five months. The case was subsequently marked as inactive and disposed of, with the final judgment closing the entire case.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case, initiated by Daniel Branthroover with a petition for divorce filed on March 9, 2010, culminated in a final order of dismissal issued by Judge Margaret Barnes on August 13, 2010, effectively closing the case. Both parties, Daniel Kenneth Branthrover and Kristine N. Branthrover, were notified of the judgment on August 19, 2010. The case is now classified as inactive and disposed, with all files sent to Records Management for storage on October 22, 2010.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case is a divorce without children filed by Daniel Branthrover, which was concluded with a final order of dismissal on August 13, 2010. The docket indicates a straightforward process with a single petition filed and a subsequent dismissal hearing, resulting in a swift resolution within a few months. Overall, the case appears to be of low complexity, as evidenced by the absence of contested issues or multiple

hearings. The case status is marked as inactive and disposed, indicating that all matters have been resolved. </p> <p><b>Experts:</b> There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case initiated by Daniel Branthoover, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by either party. The case concluded with a Final Order of Dismissal on August 13, 2010, suggesting that it was resolved without expert testimony or involvement. </p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket entries indicate that the case involved a divorce petition filed by Daniel Branthoover, but no specific monetary amount related to assets, alimony, or child support is mentioned. Given the nature of divorce cases, a rough estimate could vary widely based on the couple's assets and liabilities; however, without additional financial details, it is not possible to ascertain a specific monetary value. The case concluded with a dismissal order, suggesting that no financial resolution was reached.</p>

## [Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine Nicole Branthoover](#)

### **Extract**

#### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Kenneth Branthoover is listed as a party in the case, but there is no indication of whether he is the Plaintiff or Defendant based on the docket entries provided. Since Kristine Nicole Branthoover is the only other named party, it is reasonable to infer that Daniel Kenneth Branthoover could be the Defendant, assuming typical naming conventions in legal documents where the first-listed party is often the Plaintiff. However, without additional context or specific designations in the docket, this remains speculative.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and officially terminated on February 17, 2006. Given that the termination date indicates the conclusion of all proceedings, the case has indeed been closed.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The docket indicates that a case was filed on October 6, 2005, but provides no details regarding the cause of action or factual background. The case was subsequently terminated on February 17, 2006, suggesting a swift resolution, though the nature of the claims or issues involved remains unspecified.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The legal docket reveals that the case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated on February 17, 2006, indicating a brief duration of proceedings. Daniel Kenneth Branthoover is listed as a party but lacks any indication of legal counsel or representation, which suggests he was likely a litigant rather than an attorney in the matter. The absence of counsel associated with both Daniel and Kristine Nicole Branthoover further supports this interpretation, highlighting a potential pro se litigation scenario. Overall, the motion practice in this case appears to have been minimal, given the limited docket entries and the straightforward timeline of the case.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated on February 17, 2006, indicating a duration of approximately 4 months and 11 days from start to finish. This timeframe reflects the period

in which the case was actively managed within the court system.</p><p><b>Outcome:</b> The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and was terminated on February 17, 2006, indicating a relatively quick resolution. The docket does not provide specific details regarding the reason for termination, whether it was settled, dismissed, or otherwise concluded. Further details would be required to fully understand the circumstances surrounding the case's outcome.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated shortly thereafter on February 17, 2006, indicating a very brief duration of activity. The limited timeline suggests a lack of complexity, as there were no additional docket entries indicating extensive litigation, motions, or hearings. This brevity implies that the issues at stake were likely straightforward or resolved quickly.</p><p><b>Experts:</b> The docket indicates that Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine Nicole Branthoover were the parties involved in the case, but there are no counsel listed for either party, suggesting they represented themselves. The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated on February 17, 2006, without any mention of expert involvement or testimony, indicating a lack of expert witnesses or consultants in this matter.</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket indicates that the case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated relatively quickly on February 17, 2006, suggesting it may have been a minor or straightforward matter. However, without specific monetary claims or further details regarding the nature of the case, it is difficult to estimate a precise monetary value; it could range from a few thousand dollars to possibly tens of thousands, depending on the context.</p>

## [Aaron Dorn vs Daniel Branthoover and All Occupants](#)

### **Extract**

### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Branthoover served as the Defendant in the case, as indicated by the docket entries and the case parties section. The judgment awarded \$1,000.00 to Plaintiff Aaron Dorn against Branthoover, confirming his role as the party being sued.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been disposed, indicating that it has finished and been closed. A judgment for the plaintiff, Aaron Dorn, was awarded against Daniel Branthoover on January 6, 2014, with a monetary award of \$1,000.00. All relevant entries suggest that the litigation process has concluded following the judgment.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case is a forcible entry and detainer, as indicated by the Plaintiff's Original Petition filed on December 11, 2013, against Defendant Daniel Branthoover. The factual background reveals that a citation was served to Branthoover on December 20, 2013, with a response due by December 25, 2013, leading to a trial held on January 6, 2014, where judgment was awarded in favor of Plaintiff Aaron Dorn for \$1,000.00.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The motion practice in this case primarily revolved around a forcible entry and detainer action, with Daniel Branthoover serving as the Defendant. A

judgment was rendered against him on January 6, 2014, awarding the Plaintiff, Aaron Dorn, \$1,000, following a trial reset from December 30, 2013, to January 6, 2014. The docket indicates that Branthoover was served with the citation on December 20, 2013, and was required to respond by December 25, 2013, but the outcome favored the Plaintiff, suggesting that Branthoover's defense was unsuccessful.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case began on December 11, 2013, when the Plaintiff's Original Petition was filed, and it was disposed of with a judgment for the Plaintiff on January 6, 2014. Therefore, the case lasted a total of 26 days from start to finish.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The court ruled in favor of the Plaintiff, Aaron Dorn, awarding him a judgment of \$1,000.00 against Defendant Daniel Branthoover. The trial was conducted by Judge Mike Bateman on January 6, 2014, and the judgment was subsequently mailed to both parties. The case has been officially disposed.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case involves an eviction proceeding where a judgment was rendered in favor of the plaintiff, Aaron Dorn, against the defendant, Daniel Branthoover, for \$1,000. The docket entries indicate a straightforward process with a single trial date, a notice of hearing, and the issuance and service of the forcible entry and detainer citation. The case was disposed of promptly following the judgment, suggesting a relatively uncomplicated legal matter.</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Daniel Branthoover, the Defendant. The proceedings revolve around a forcible entry and detainer action resulting in a judgment against him in favor of the Plaintiff, Aaron Dorn, for \$1,000. The entries primarily detail procedural aspects of the case, including the trial date and judgment issuance, without reference to expert testimony or analysis.</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The case involved a judgment in favor of the plaintiff, Aaron Dorn, against the defendant, Daniel Branthoover, with a monetary award of \$1,000.00. This indicates that the case was relatively small in terms of monetary value, suggesting it may involve a straightforward dispute, potentially related to rental or property issues given the context of forcible entry and detainer.</p>

## [In the Matter of the Marriage of Molly Marie Anthony and Daniel Kenneth Branthoover](#)

### **Extract**

### **Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Branthoover served as the Respondent in the case, which involved a divorce proceeding initiated by Molly Marie Anthony, who was the Petitioner. The entries indicate that he was represented by counsel and that the case concluded with an agreed final decree of divorce.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case appears to be finished and closed, as indicated by the entry on 12/17/2014, which records a "Final Order/Judgment/Decree" that closes the entire case. Additionally, the case status is marked as "Inactive: Disposed," confirming that no further actions

are pending. The last relevant entry in the docket is from 06/03/2015, when the file was sent to Records Management for storage, further suggesting the matter has been resolved.

</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case is divorce, as indicated by the "Original Petition for Divorce" filed on September 22, 2014. The factual background includes the submission of a proposed order and the waiver of service by the defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, culminating in an "Agreed Final Decree of Divorce" issued by Judge Margaret E. Barnes on December 17, 2014, which closed the case.

</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> Daniel Branthoover, as the Respondent in this divorce case, actively participated in the proceedings, demonstrated by the timely Waiver of Service or Citation filed on October 28, 2014, indicating he was aware of the case from its inception. The case culminated in an Agreed Final Decree of Divorce entered by Judge Margaret E. Barnes on December 17, 2014, closing the matter effectively, with Branthoover properly notified of the final decree. The docket reflects that all procedural steps were followed, ensuring Branthoover's rights were preserved throughout the process.

</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case lasted from September 22, 2014, when the Original Petition for Divorce was filed, until December 17, 2014, when the Final Order was issued, resulting in a duration of approximately 3 months. The case was subsequently deemed inactive and disposed of, with the final decree marking the closure of the proceedings.

</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case concluded with an Agreed Final Decree of Divorce between Molly Marie Anthony and Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, issued by Judicial Officer Margaret E. Barnes on December 17, 2014, effectively closing the case. The final judgment was entered following a prove-up of divorce proceedings that did not require a record. Subsequent to the decree, relevant notifications were sent to the parties involved, and the case has since been marked as inactive and disposed as of June 3, 2015, when the file was sent to Records Management for storage.

</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case involves a straightforward divorce without children, culminating in an agreed final decree issued by the court on December 17, 2014. The proceedings appear to have been uncomplicated, as indicated by the lack of contentious filings and the quick entry of judgment following a waiver of service. The docket entries reflect a procedural nature, with no significant disputes or complexities noted. Overall, the case can be characterized as low in complexity.

</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the divorce case between Daniel Branthoover and Molly Marie Anthony. The records reflect that Branthoover was notified of the proceedings and actively participated through his counsel, culminating in an Agreed Final Decree of Divorce entered by Judge Margaret E. Barnes on December 17, 2014, thereby closing the case.

</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The docket entries indicate that this case involved a divorce between Molly Marie Anthony and Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, culminating in an agreed final decree of divorce. There are no specific monetary claims or amounts mentioned in the entries; therefore, it is reasonable to estimate that the case likely involved standard divorce-related financial matters, which could range from zero to several tens of thousands of dollars, depending on asset division and other factors typical in divorce cases.

[\*\*FARMERS & MERCHANTS STATE BANK vs. DANIEL KENNETH BRANTHOOVER\*\*](#)

**Extract**

**Summary**

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Kenneth Branthoover is identified as the Defendant in the case, as indicated in the docket entries and the case parties section. The Plaintiff in this matter is Farmers & Merchants State Bank, which is represented by counsel Royce Coleman. The case involves a claim related to default on a loan, with a judgment rendered in favor of the Plaintiff.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been disposed, indicating that it has finished and been closed. The final judgment was in favor of the plaintiff, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, with a total judgment amount of \$3,243.06 plus attorney fees of \$1,500, minus a credit of \$1,500 due to a payment agreed judgment. The last relevant docket entry was recorded on 09/11/2003, with earlier entries detailing the issuance and service of citations and writs of execution.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case is a default on a loan, as indicated by the conversion case filing. The plaintiff, Farmers & Merchants State Bank, sought a judgment against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover for the amount of \$3,243.06, along with attorney fees of \$1,500.00 and accrued interest, totaling \$4,318.48. An agreed judgment was reached, wherein the plaintiff was awarded the specified amounts, minus a credit of \$1,500.00 due to a prior payment agreement.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The case against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover involved a default on a loan, leading to an agreed judgment in favor of Farmers & Merchants State Bank for a total amount of \$4,243.06, which included \$1,500 in attorney fees. Branthoover was served with citations on multiple occasions, first on March 4, 2003, and subsequently with a writ of execution on October 16, 2003, indicating his acknowledgment of the legal proceedings. The judgment was reached after Branthoover did not contest the claims, resulting in a resolution that included a credit for a prior payment, suggesting a negotiated settlement rather than prolonged litigation. The case was ultimately disposed of following the agreed judgment on May 1, 2003.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case commenced on March 4, 2003, with the filing of the conversion case, and concluded with the issuance of an agreed judgment on May 1, 2003. The duration of the case from start to finish was approximately 59 days.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> The case resulted in an agreed judgment in favor of the plaintiff, Farmers & Merchants State Bank, against defendant Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, with a total judgment amount of \$3,243.06 plus \$1,500.00 in attorney's fees, reduced by a \$1,500.00 credit due to a payment agreement. The case was filed due to default on a loan, with total fees amounting to \$4,318.48, and was disposed of following the issuance and service of citations and a writ of execution.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case appears relatively straightforward, involving a writ of execution related to a default on a loan, with a judgment amount of \$3,243.06 plus attorney fees of \$1,500, which was agreed upon by the parties. The docket entries indicate that the plaintiff (Farmers & Merchants State Bank)

successfully obtained a judgment against the defendant (Daniel Kenneth Branthoover) without any complex legal issues or extensive litigation, as evidenced by the agreed judgment and the service of citations. The matter seems primarily focused on the enforcement of the agreed judgment rather than intricate legal disputes.</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> The docket does not indicate that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, the Defendant. The case primarily revolves around a default on a loan, leading to an agreed judgment in favor of the Plaintiff, Farmers & Merchants State Bank, for a total amount of \$4,243.06, which includes attorney fees. The proceedings included citations issued and served to Branthoover, confirming his participation in the legal process.</p> <p><b>Monetary value:</b> The case involves a judgment amount of \$3,243.06 plus \$1,500.00 in attorney fees, but a credit of \$1,500.00 was applied due to a payment agreement, resulting in a net judgment of \$3,243.06. Additionally, there were total fees claimed of \$4,318.48, which includes interest and attorney fees. Thus, the estimated monetary value of the case is approximately \$4,318.48.</p>

[Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc., Plaintiff, v. Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, Defendant.](#)

## Extract

### Summary

<p><b>Role:</b> Daniel Kenneth Branthoover is listed as the Defendant in the case, while Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. is the Plaintiff. The final judgment was issued against Branthoover, indicating a default judgment in favor of the Plaintiff. Multiple entries in the docket reflect the procedural actions taken against him throughout the case.</p> <p><b>Status:</b> The case has been closed, as indicated by the entry dated 12/01/2009, which notes the issuance of a Final Order/Judgment that closes the entire case. The current case status is listed as "Inactive: Disposed," confirming the case has concluded and is no longer active.</p> <p><b>Background:</b> The cause of action in this case was initiated by Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, as reflected in the Plaintiff's Original Petition filed on May 22, 2009. The factual background includes allegations that led to the filing of an Application for Writ of Sequestration and subsequent motions for default judgment, culminating in a final order issued on December 1, 2009, which resulted in a default judgment against the defendant.</p> <p><b>Motion practice:</b> The motion practice in this case involved Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. filing a motion for default judgment against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, which culminated in a final order issued on December 1, 2009, closing the case. The court documented multiple notifications to Branthoover, including a certified copy of the final order sent on December 2, 2009, and an abstract of judgment mailed on February 2, 2010, indicating that he was adequately informed of the proceedings and the judgment against him. Additionally, a citation was

mailed to him, and despite these notifications, he failed to respond, leading to the default judgment enforced by the court. Branthoover's lack of participation was significant, as it directly resulted in the court's ruling in favor of the plaintiff.</p> <p><b>Duration:</b> The case started on May 22, 2009, when the Plaintiff's Original Petition was filed, and concluded with the Final Order/Judgment on December 1, 2009. Therefore, the case lasted approximately 6 months and 10 days from start to finish.</p>

<p><b>Outcome:</b> The case involved Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. filing a suit against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, culminating in a default judgment issued on December 1, 2009, due to Branthoover's lack of response. The court subsequently closed the case with a final order on December 2, 2009. Notifications of the ruling were sent to the defendant's attorney, and the case has been marked as inactive and disposed as of December 16, 2010.</p> <p><b>Complexity:</b> The case appears to be relatively straightforward, centering around a breach of contract claim by Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, culminating in a default judgment due to Branthoover's lack of response.

The proceedings involved multiple petitions, motions, and affidavits but did not escalate into complex litigation, as indicated by the issuance of a default judgment and the absence of extensive discovery or trial proceedings.

Overall, the case seems to reflect a standard debt recovery situation rather than a complex legal battle.</p> <p><b>Experts:</b> There is no

indication in the docket that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, the Defendant. The docket primarily reflects procedural entries related to the default judgment issued against him by the court and the actions taken by the Plaintiff, Wachovia Dealer Services Inc.</p> <p><b>Monetary

value:</b> The docket indicates that a default judgment was issued in favor of Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, but it does not specify a monetary amount. The case involved a writ of sequestration and multiple petitions, suggesting potential financial stakes, but without specific figures, a rough estimate of the claim could reasonably be inferred to be in the low to mid five-figure range, typical for cases involving default judgments and financial services disputes.</p>

This memo was compiled by Vincent AI based on vLex materials available as of June 10, 2025. [View full answer on vLex](#)