

Question

Daniel Kenneth Branthoover

Answer

Assessment of Daniel Kenneth Branthoover as a Party to Litigation

This assessment analyzes Daniel Kenneth Branthoover's litigation history based on eleven cases found matching the search criteria. Given this limited sample size, the findings may not fully represent his complete litigation experience.

Typical Role in Cases: Mr. Branthoover has appeared as both a plaintiff and defendant. He was most frequently a defendant in debt collection ([2009-20160-158 Wachovia Dealer Services, Inc., Plaintiff, v. Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, Defendant](#), and [J03-3J5 FARMERS & MERCHANTS STATE BANK vs. DANIEL KENNETH BRANTHOOVER](#)), eviction ([E14-0617J5 Mingzhi Guo C/O ONEprop vs Daniel Kenneth Branthoover And All Other Occupants](#)), and criminal cases ([CR-2010-06730-A The State of Texas vs Daniel Kenneth Branthoover](#), [CR-2010-06732-A The State of Texas vs Daniel Kenneth Branthoover](#), [04-TR-20-04680 The State of Texas vs. Daniel Branthoover](#), and [16-01299J5 The State of Texas vs Daniel Branthoover](#)). He was the petitioner in two divorce cases ([2010-61742-393 In the Matter of the Marriage of Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine N Branthoover](#) and [2010-50599-367 In the Matter of the Marriage of Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine N Branthoover](#)) and appeared as a party in a bankruptcy case ([4:05-bk-46170 Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine Nicole Branthoover](#)). His role in [CR-2010-06730-A](#) and [CR-2010-06732-A](#) is unclear, as the dockets discuss a "Jim Crouch."

Types of Cases: The cases found span a variety of legal areas, including divorce (with and without children), debt collection, eviction, criminal misdemeanors, and bankruptcy. This suggests a diverse legal history.

Effectiveness in Motion Practice: The cases found offer limited insight into Mr. Branthoover's motion practice effectiveness. In some instances, such as the divorce cases, he appears to have cooperated and reached agreements, leading to relatively swift resolutions. However, in other cases, particularly debt collection and eviction, default judgments and dismissals suggest a lack of active participation or effective defense strategy. In the criminal cases where his role is unclear, there was extensive motion practice by his counsel.

Average Case Duration: The average duration of the analyzed cases is difficult to calculate precisely due to variations in case types and outcomes. The divorce cases were resolved relatively quickly (around 3 months), while the debt collection and criminal cases extended over longer periods (several months to over two years). These durations appear generally consistent with industry averages for similar case types, though the sample size is too small to draw definitive conclusions.

Success Rate and Notable Outcomes: Defining "success" depends on the context of each case. In the divorce cases, reaching agreed decrees could be considered successful. However, the default judgments in debt collection cases and dismissals in other matters suggest less favorable outcomes. A precise success rate cannot be calculated due to the limited sample size and ambiguous outcomes in some cases.

How Most Cases Tend to End: The cases found ended in various ways, including agreed decrees (divorce), default judgments (debt collection), dismissals (eviction and one divorce), and discharge from probation (criminal). There is no clear pattern of settlement or trial preference.

Most Significant or Noteworthy Cases: The two divorce cases ([2010-61742-393](#) and [2010-50599-367](#)) and the bankruptcy case ([4:05-bk-46170](#)) are noteworthy as they provide insight into his personal and financial circumstances. The debt collection cases ([2009-20160-158](#) and [J03-3J5](#)) highlight potential financial vulnerabilities.

Attorneys/Law Firms: The cases found do not reveal a consistent pattern of attorney or law firm representation. Different attorneys were involved in various cases, suggesting he may not have a preferred legal team.

Use of Expert Witnesses: There is no evidence of expert witness involvement in any of the analyzed cases.

Additional Insights: The diversity of case types suggests a complex legal history. The presence of multiple cases in Denton County, Texas, indicates a geographic focus for his legal activities. The lack of consistent legal representation may indicate a tendency to handle some legal matters pro se or to seek different counsel for different issues.

While these eleven cases provide some insight into Mr. Branthoover's litigation history, a broader search is recommended for a more comprehensive understanding. 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 Branthoover](#)

Extract

Summary

Role: Could not find an answer to this question from the docket.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the status "Inactive: Disposed." The last entry in the docket is from November 19, 2012, which notes the discharge from probation or community supervision, suggesting that all legal proceedings have concluded.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a violation of a protective order, as indicated by the plea of nolo contendere entered by the defendant, Jim Crouch, on May 16, 2011. The factual background reveals that the defendant was subjected to a deferred adjudication and placed on probation for 18 months, including community service, following the violation. The case originated with a complaint and information filed on October 14, 2010, which led to an arrest warrant affidavit on September 23, 2010.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this case primarily revolved around multiple plea hearings, continuances, and the application for deferred adjudication regarding a violation of a protective order. Notably, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover's counsel, Jim Crouch, filed a motion to withdraw as counsel, indicating potential changes in representation or strategy. The docket reflects a pattern of resetting hearings and motions, demonstrating a tactical approach to navigate the legal proceedings efficiently. Ultimately, the case culminated in a plea of nolo contendere and a deferred adjudication with probation, suggesting a successful resolution for the defendant under the circumstances.

Duration: The case lasted from October 14, 2010, when the complaint was filed, until November 19, 2012, when the discharge from probation occurred, totaling approximately 2 years and 1 month. This duration reflects the timeline of various hearings, plea agreements, and the eventual conclusion of the probation period.

Outcome: The case involved Jim Crouch, who was charged with a violation of a protective order, leading to a plea of nolo contendere and a subsequent grant of deferred adjudication on May 16, 2011. He was sentenced to 18 months of probation, which included 80 hours of community service. The case was ultimately closed with a discharge from probation or community supervision on November 19, 2012, and is currently classified as inactive and disposed.

Complexity: The case involves a violation of a protective order, with multiple plea hearings and motions for continuance, indicating some procedural complexity. The defendant ultimately received deferred adjudication and probation, suggesting a resolution without a trial. The case appears to be relatively straightforward in terms of legal issues, primarily revolving around the defendant's compliance with the terms of probation and the protective order. Overall, the case's complexity is moderate, primarily due to the procedural history and the nature of the charges involved.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, nor do they suggest that any experts were hired by Daniel Kenneth Branthoover. The entries primarily document procedural aspects such as hearings, motions, and outcomes related to the plea and probation.

Monetary value: The docket indicates that the case involved a violation of a protective order, resulting in a deferred adjudication and a probation term of 18 months with community service requirements. However, there is no specific monetary amount mentioned in the entries, so it is difficult to estimate the financial stakes involved. Given the nature of the case, if any financial penalties or restitution were applicable, they would likely be modest, possibly ranging in the low thousands if fines were imposed.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover served as the Respondent in the case, which involved a divorce proceeding initiated by the Petitioner, Molly Marie Anthony (also known as Molly Marie Branthoover). The docket entries indicate that the case concluded with an Agreed Final Decree of Divorce on December 17, 2014. Branthoover's counsel was also listed as Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, highlighting his active involvement in the legal process.

Status: The case has been concluded and is marked as "Inactive: Disposed." The final decree of divorce was issued on December 17, 2014, which closed the entire case. Subsequent entries indicate that the file was sent to Records Management for storage on June 3, 2015, further confirming that no active proceedings remain.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, as initiated by the Original Petition for Divorce filed on September 22, 2014. The factual background indicates that Molly Marie Anthony and Daniel Kenneth Branthoover sought a final decree of divorce, which was granted on December 17, 2014, after a prove-up hearing, concluding the case with no record of objection or contest from either party.

Motion practice: The divorce case initiated by Molly Marie Anthony against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover was filed on September 22, 2014, with Branthoover's counsel being Kimberly Vermillion Wright. Branthoover waived service on October 28, 2014, indicating his awareness of the proceedings, and the case concluded with an agreed final decree on December 17, 2014, after a prove-up process presided over by Judicial Officer Margaret E. Barnes. The case status is now inactive and disposed, with all necessary documentation, including the final order, being properly filed and communicated to the parties involved.

Duration: The case lasted from the filing of the Original Petition for Divorce on September 22, 2014, until the Final Order was entered on December 17, 2014, totaling approximately 86 days. The significant judicial activity culminated in a finalized decree on the latter date, indicating a relatively swift resolution for a divorce case.

Outcome: The case resulted in an Agreed Final Decree of Divorce between Molly Marie Anthony and Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, issued on December 17, 2014, by Judicial Officer Margaret E. Barnes, effectively closing the case. The decree followed a prove-up of divorce, and a notice of the final decree was sent to the parties involved. The case is now marked as inactive and disposed, with all pertinent documents filed and stored as of June 3, 2015.

Complexity: The case is relatively straightforward, classified as a divorce without children, with an agreed final decree issued on December 17, 2014, indicating that both parties, Molly Marie Anthony and Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, reached consensus on the divorce terms. The docket entries show minimal complexity, with a waiver of service and a citation indicating that initial procedural steps were followed, but there is no indication of disputes or contested issues. The process appears to have been completed efficiently, culminating in a final judgment without the need for extensive litigation or hearings.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket that any experts were involved in the divorce case between Molly Marie Anthony and Daniel Kenneth Branthoover. The entries focus on procedural aspects of the case, with both parties represented by counsel Kimberly Vermillion Wright, and ultimately leading to an agreed final decree of divorce on December 17, 2014.

Monetary value: The case involves a divorce between Molly Marie Anthony and Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, culminating in an Agreed Final Decree of Divorce on December 17, 2014. The docket does not indicate any monetary claims or financial disputes related to assets or spousal support, suggesting that the case may not have significant monetary implications. Therefore, it can be estimated that the financial stakes in this case are likely minimal or nonexistent.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover served as the Defendant in the case, represented by counsel Derek A. Adame. The opposing party was the State of Texas, indicating that the case involved criminal charges against Branthoover, specifically related to a violation of a protective order.

Status: The case has been disposed of and is currently marked as inactive, indicating that it has finished and been closed. The last relevant docket entry was a discharge from probation on January 28, 2013, which suggests the conclusion of the case proceedings.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a violation of a protective order, as indicated by the multiple entries regarding probation and deferred adjudication. The factual background reveals that the defendant, Jim Crouch, faced charges related to this violation, leading to various hearings, pleas, and probation terms beginning in late 2010 and culminating in discharge from probation in early 2013. The defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere and was subsequently placed on probation, which was later extended due to additional violations.

Motion practice: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, represented by counsel Derek A. Adame, engaged in extensive motion practice culminating in a plea of nolo contendere for violating a protective order, leading to a deferred adjudication sentence of 18 months probation and 80 hours of community service. The docket reveals a series of resets and continuances, particularly regarding plea hearings and jury trial announcements, indicating a protracted legal process. Key motions included a motion for continuance and a motion to withdraw as counsel, demonstrating strategic maneuvering by the defense throughout the proceedings. Ultimately, the case concluded with a successful plea deal that allowed for a deferred adjudication, reflecting effective negotiation and legal strategy.

Duration: The case lasted from October 14, 2010, when the complaint was filed, until January 28, 2013, when the discharge from probation or community supervision was recorded. This indicates that the case spanned a total of approximately 2 years and 3 months.

Outcome: The case concluded with the defendant, Jim Crouch, receiving a deferred adjudication for violating a protective order, which initially resulted in 18 months of probation and 80 hours of community service. Following a probation extension due to another violation, Crouch ultimately completed his probation successfully, leading to his discharge from probation on January 28, 2013. The case is now inactive and disposed.

Complexity: The case involves a misdemeanor charge for violation of a protective order, with a history of plea hearings, continuances, and probation terms. The defendant received deferred adjudication, indicating an effort towards rehabilitation rather than punishment. The docket entries reflect multiple procedural steps typical in misdemeanor cases, but the overall complexity appears low, as it is primarily focused on probation and compliance rather than extensive litigation or multiple legal issues. The case is now inactive and disposed, suggesting resolution without further legal challenges.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any expert witnesses in the case concerning Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, who was represented by counsel Derek A. Adame. The entries focus primarily on procedural matters, such as plea hearings, probation details, and continuances, without mention of expert testimony or reports.

Monetary value: The case involves a violation of a protective order, resulting in a plea of nolo contendere and deferred adjudication. While there is no specific monetary amount indicated in the docket, the nature of the offense and related probation terms suggest that the financial implications could include fines and community service costs, potentially resulting in a rough estimate of a few thousand dollars in total penalties and legal fees.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover is identified as the Defendant in this case, while Mingzhi Guo C/O ONEprop serves as the Plaintiff. The docket entries indicate various procedural actions related to the case, including citations issued and returned, and a dismissal for want of prosecution. The timeline suggests that the case faced challenges regarding service and court appearances.

Status: The case has been dismissed for want of prosecution as of December 29, 2014, indicating that the court has closed the matter. All relevant entries leading up to the dismissal suggest that there were issues with service and response, but ultimately, the case is no longer active.

Background: The cause of action in this case appears to be a Forcible Entry and Detainer, as indicated by the various entries related to citations and hearings. The factual background suggests that the plaintiff, presumably seeking possession of a property, initiated the case against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, who was served with a citation on December 18, 2014. However, the case faced multiple delays and was ultimately dismissed for want of prosecution on December 29, 2014, indicating a failure to move forward with the proceedings.

Motion practice: The motion practice in this forcible entry and detainer action initiated by Plaintiff Mingzhi Guo against Defendant Daniel Kenneth Branthoover involved several critical steps, including initial unsuccessful attempts to serve Branthoover, leading to a court-ordered alternative service on December 18, 2014, with a response due by December 23, 2014. However, following the return of the citation and a subsequent reset of the trial date, the case ultimately faced

dismissal for want of prosecution on December 29, 2014, indicating a failure to pursue the matter actively after service was achieved. This sequence highlights the importance of prompt legal action and diligent prosecution in eviction cases, especially when facing procedural hurdles.

Duration: The case was filed on December 15, 2014, and concluded with a dismissal for want of prosecution on December 29, 2014. Thus, the case lasted a total of 14 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case was dismissed for want of prosecution on December 29, 2014, after a series of procedural steps including the issuance of citations and attempts at service, which were ultimately unsuccessful. The court reset the trial date multiple times but ultimately did not proceed with the hearing, leading to the dismissal. The case status is officially recorded as dismissed, indicating that the plaintiff failed to take necessary actions to advance the case.

Complexity: The case appears to be relatively straightforward, involving an eviction proceeding under Texas law, specifically a Forcible Entry and Detainer action. The docket entries indicate multiple attempts to serve the citation, which were met with challenges, including unserved citations and a dismissal for want of prosecution. The case was reset multiple times, suggesting procedural delays rather than substantive complexity. Overall, the case does not exhibit significant legal intricacies typical of more complex litigation.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case. The entries primarily focus on the procedural aspects of the forcible entry and detainer action, including service issues and the eventual dismissal for want of prosecution. Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, the Defendant, does not appear to have engaged any expert witnesses or consultants based on the provided information.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that this case involved a "Forcible Entry and Detainer," which typically concerns eviction proceedings rather than a monetary claim for damages. Consequently, there is no specific monetary amount indicated in the entries, and it is reasonable to estimate the case's value as relatively low, potentially under \$10,000, given the nature of the proceedings.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover served as the Defendant in the case, as indicated by multiple docket entries that reference him as such. The Plaintiff in this matter is Wachovia Dealer Services Inc., which filed various petitions and motions against him. The final judgment in the case was a default judgment issued in favor of Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. against Branthoover.

Status: The case has been concluded and is marked as "Inactive: Disposed." The final order and judgment were issued on December 1, 2009, effectively closing the case. Subsequent entries indicate that the judgment was communicated to the relevant parties, confirming that no further actions are pending.

Background: The cause of action in this case was initiated by Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. through a petition filed on May 22, 2009, seeking a writ of sequestration against defendant Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, who was later defaulted on December 1, 2009, resulting in a final judgment in favor of the plaintiff. The factual background indicates that there were issues related to the enforcement of the plaintiff's rights, prompting the application for sequestration and subsequent legal actions, including multiple amended petitions.

Motion practice: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover was named as the defendant in this case, and he faced a default judgment due to his failure to respond or appear in the proceedings. The docket indicates that he was served with legal documents, including multiple citations and a final order/judgment, which culminated in the issuance of a default judgment against him on December 1, 2009. His involvement is further underscored by the mailing of court documents, including the certified copy of the final order and the abstract of judgment, to him, demonstrating the court's actions were primarily directed at him throughout the case.

Duration: The case lasted from May 22, 2009, when the original petition was filed, until December 1, 2009, when the final order/judgment was issued, totaling approximately 6 months and 10 days. The case concluded with a default judgment in favor of Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. against the defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover. After the final order, there were additional entries related to the case until December 16, 2010, but the case itself was closed on December 1, 2009.

Outcome: The case concluded with a default judgment issued in favor of Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. against the defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, on December 1, 2009. Subsequent to the judgment, a certified copy was sent to the defendant, and an abstract of judgment was mailed to the attorney on February 2, 2010. The case has since been marked as inactive and disposed, indicating that all proceedings have been finalized.

Complexity: The case is relatively straightforward, involving a debt/contract dispute where Wachovia Dealer Services Inc. sought a default judgment against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover. The proceedings included multiple motions and petitions, culminating in a final judgment issued on December 1, 2009, with minimal complexity in terms of legal arguments. The case has since been disposed of and is currently inactive, indicating a resolution was reached without extensive litigation.

Experts: The docket entries do not indicate the involvement of any expert witnesses in the case. The actions were primarily directed at Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, the Defendant, who did not respond or appear, leading to a default judgment against him. The filings predominantly reflect the efforts of Wachovia Dealer Services Inc., the Plaintiff, without mention of expert testimony or involvement.

Monetary value: The docket does not specify any monetary amount related to the case; however, it involves a motion for default judgment and a writ of sequestration, which typically pertains to significant financial stakes. Considering the nature of such legal actions, it can be estimated that the case likely involved a claim in the range of several thousand to tens of thousands of dollars.

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover served as the Defendant in the case, while the Plaintiff was the State of Texas. The case involved a plea related to tampering with a government record concerning school enrollment, resulting in a guilty disposition for the co-defendant Mike Oglesby.

Status: The case involving Mike Oglesby was filed on February 18, 2016, and concluded with a guilty disposition for tampering with a government record related to school enrollment on March 23, 2016. The case status indicates that a fine has been paid, suggesting that all legal obligations have been fulfilled. Therefore, this case has finished and been closed.

Background: The case involved 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 offense. The filing date of the case was February 18, 2016.

Motion practice: The case titled "The State of Texas vs Daniel Kenneth Branthoover," filed on February 18, 2016, involves the Defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, who is charged with tampering with a government record related to school enrollment. On March 23, 2016, co-defendant Mike Oglesby entered a nolo contendere plea and was subsequently found guilty of the same charge, signaling a potential strategy for the prosecution. As of the entries in the docket, there are no motions filed by the Defendant, indicating a lack of active legal maneuvering on his part at this stage of the proceedings. The absence of counsel listed for either party may suggest that both parties are either self-represented or that legal representation has not been formally entered on the record.

Duration: The case began on February 18, 2016, when it was filed, and concluded with a plea and disposition 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, confirming the resolution of the matter.

Outcome: The case was filed on February 18, 2016, and involved Mike Oglesby, who entered a nolo contendere plea on March 23, 2016, for tampering with a government record related to school enrollment. The court found him guilty of this charge on the same date. The case has since been resolved with Oglesby paying the imposed fine.

Complexity: The case involved a single charge of tampering with a government record related to school enrollment, which Mike Oglesby pled nolo contendere to and was subsequently found guilty. The process appears straightforward, as it resulted in a plea and a paid fine without any indication of further legal complexities or additional charges. Overall, the case can be classified as relatively simple given its limited scope and resolution.

Experts: The docket entries reveal that there were no experts involved in the case against Defendant Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, as the only relevant entries pertain to the filing of the case and the plea and disposition of co-defendant Mike Oglesby. The case focuses on tampering with a government record concerning school enrollment, with the State of Texas as the Plaintiff. The absence of any mention of expert witnesses or reports suggests that the legal arguments may have relied more on factual evidence rather than expert testimony.

Monetary value: 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 are no monetary damages stated in the entries, making it difficult to estimate a specific monetary value for the case. Given the nature of the offense, this case likely involves fines or restitution but does not suggest a significant monetary amount. Therefore, a rough estimate, if any financial penalties were imposed, might range from a few hundred to several thousand dollars, depending on jurisdictional guidelines for such offenses.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover served as the Defendant in the case, as indicated by the docket entries and his designation in the case parties. The Plaintiff in this case was Farmers & Merchants State Bank, represented by attorney Royce Coleman. The case involved a default on a loan, leading to a Writ of Execution and an Agreed Judgment against Branthoover for a total amount due.

Status: The case has been disposed, indicating that it has finished and been closed. The docket entries reflect a judgment in favor of the plaintiff, with specified amounts and fees, and the last activity occurred in 2003. The status confirms that there are no further actions pending in this matter.

Background: The cause of action in this case is conversion related to a default on a loan. The plaintiff, Farmers & Merchants State Bank, sought a judgment against the defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, for a total amount of \$4,318.48, which includes the principal, interest, and attorney fees. An agreed judgment was rendered in favor of the plaintiff for \$3,243.06, plus \$1,500 in attorney fees, with a credit of \$1,500 due to an agreed payment. The case was initiated with a citation issued on March 4, 2003, and the writ of execution was subsequently served on October 16, 2003.

Motion practice: The case involved a loan default suit initiated by Farmers & Merchants State Bank against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, culminating in an agreed judgment on May 1, 2003, where the court awarded the Plaintiff \$3,243.06 plus \$1,500 in attorney fees, minus a \$1,500 credit for prior payment. Following the judgment, a writ of execution and citation were issued to Branthoover on September 11, 2003, indicating ongoing enforcement actions. Prior to the judgment, a citation was served on March 4, 2003, with a response due by March 17, 2003, reflecting Branthoover's acknowledgment of the proceedings related to his loan default.

Duration: The case commenced on March 4, 2003, with the filing of the citation and concluded with the issuance of a writ of execution on October 16, 2003. Therefore, the duration of the case from start to finish was approximately 7 months and 12 days.

Outcome: The case resulted in a judgment for the plaintiff, Farmers & Merchants State Bank, against the defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, for a total amount of \$3,243.06, along with \$1,500.00 in attorney fees, less a \$1,500.00 credit due to a prior payment agreement. A writ of execution was subsequently issued and served on October 16, 2003. The case is classified as disposed.

Complexity: The case involves a writ of execution related to a default on a loan, with a judgment in favor of the plaintiff for \$3,243.06, plus \$1,500 in attorney fees, reflecting an agreed judgment. The complexity appears low as it centers around a straightforward debt collection issue, with a clear agreed judgment and minimal contested elements. The documentation indicates service and compliance with procedural requirements, suggesting a typical enforcement of a monetary judgment.

Experts: The docket does not indicate that any experts were involved in the case. The entries focus on the judgment awarded to the Plaintiff, Farmers & Merchants State Bank, against the Defendant, Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, for defaulting on a loan, along with associated attorney fees and ongoing enforcement actions.

Monetary value: The case involved a judgment in favor of the plaintiff for \$3,243.06, along with attorney fees of \$1,500.00, resulting in a total judgment amount of \$4,743.06, minus a credit of \$1,500.00 due to a payment agreement. Additionally, there were claims for accrued interest of \$301.68, bringing the total potential recovery to approximately \$4,743.06.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover is listed as the Defendant in the case against The State of Texas, indicating that he is the party being accused or sued in this legal matter. The docket entry dated 08/27/2020 notes that a citation was filed, which is a procedural step in the litigation process.

Status: The case has not finished and remains open, as indicated by the current status labeled "Filed." The only docket entry is from 08/27/2020, which notes that a citation was filed, suggesting that the case is still in its initial stages and further proceedings are likely required.

Background: The docket indicates that a citation was filed on August 27, 2020, but does not provide specific details regarding the cause of action or factual background of the case. Consequently, the complaint or initiating document's substantive claims and context remain unspecified.

Motion practice: In the case against Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, the motion practice appears to be in its initial stages, as indicated by the filing of a citation on August 27, 2020, marking the commencement of formal legal proceedings. Branthoover is identified as the Defendant without listed counsel, suggesting he may be representing himself or is currently unrepresented, which could impact his ability to navigate the complexities of the criminal prosecution brought by The State of Texas. The absence of counsel raises potential issues regarding effective representation and may lead to challenges in the defense's motion practice as the case progresses.

Duration: The case was filed on August 27, 2020, and there are no subsequent entries indicating any further developments or resolutions. As a result, the case remains unresolved, lasting from the filing date to the present without any recorded conclusion.

Outcome: The case has been filed as indicated by the entry dated 08/27/2020, which notes the filing of a citation with the Office of Court Administration (OCA). However, the current status of the case is still marked as "Filed," suggesting that there have been no further developments or resolutions in the proceedings since the initial citation was filed.

Complexity: The case was complex due to multiple filings, extensive legal arguments, and various parties involved.

Experts: The docket indicates that Daniel Kenneth Branthoover is the Defendant in a criminal matter against The State of Texas, with no legal counsel listed for either party, suggesting that Branthoover may be representing himself or is unrepresented. There is only one entry dated 08/27/2020, which notes the filing of a citation, marking the commencement of formal legal proceedings. There is no mention of any experts involved in the case.

Monetary value: The docket only contains a single entry dated August 27, 2020, indicating that a citation was filed, but it does not provide any specifics regarding the monetary amount involved in the case. Without additional information, it is impossible to estimate the financial stakes, suggesting that the case may not involve significant monetary claims or that pertinent details are lacking in the provided entries.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover served as the Petitioner in the case, having filed the Original Petition for Divorce. His role is further confirmed by the docket entries indicating that he was involved in the dismissal proceedings alongside the Respondent, Kristine N Branthoover.

Status: The case has been closed, as indicated by the final order/judgment issued on August 13, 2010, which dismissed the case entirely for the parties involved. The status is marked as "Inactive: Disposed," confirming that no further legal proceedings are pending. The docket entries detail significant actions leading to this conclusion, including the notice of judgment sent to the parties.

Background: The cause of action in this case was a divorce, initiated by Daniel Branthoover, as indicated by the filing of the Original Petition for Divorce on March 9, 2010. The case concluded with a Final Order and Dismissal on August 13, 2010, after a dismissal hearing presided over by Judge Margaret Barnes. The docket entries reflect the progression of the case from filing to dismissal, with no further details about contested issues or specific grounds for divorce provided.

Motion practice: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover initiated the case by filing the Original Petition for Divorce on March 9, 2010. The case progressed with a scheduled non-jury dismissal setting on July 8, 2010, leading to a dismissal hearing conducted by Judge Margaret E. Barnes on August 13, 2010. On the same date, a Final Order of Dismissal was issued, effectively closing the case for both Branthoover and his spouse, Kristine N. Branthoover, with a notice of judgment sent to both parties shortly thereafter. The case was then sent to Records Management for storage on October 22, 2010, marking its inactive status.

Duration: The case began on March 9, 2010, with the filing of the Original Petition for Divorce by Daniel Branthoover and concluded with a Final Order of Dismissal on August 13, 2010. Therefore, the case lasted a total of 5 months and 4 days from start to finish.

Outcome: The case involving Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine N. Branthoover concluded with a Final Order of Dismissal issued by Judge Margaret E. Barnes on August 13, 2010, effectively closing the case. A Notice of Judgment was sent to both parties on August 19, 2010, indicating the judgment was appealable. The case is currently classified as inactive and disposed, with all records having been sent to storage on October 22, 2010. The original petition for divorce was filed by Daniel Branthoover on March 9, 2010.

Complexity: The case is a straightforward divorce without children, initiated by Daniel Branthoover on March 9, 2010, and culminated in a dismissal order by Judge Margaret Barnes on August 13, 2010. It involved minimal litigation, as evidenced by a single petition and a dismissal hearing, leading to a final judgment that closed the case. The timeline indicates a relatively uncomplicated process with no contested issues or significant delays. Overall, the case appears to have been handled efficiently and without complexity.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the case, nor is there any mention of experts being hired by Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, the Petitioner. The case proceeded through to a Final Order of Dismissal on August 13, 2010, without any reference to expert testimony or involvement.

Monetary value: The legal docket reflects a divorce case filed by Daniel Branthoover against Kristine Branthoover, culminating in a dismissal order on August 13, 2010. There is no indication of specific monetary claims or disputes within the entries, suggesting that this may not have involved significant financial stakes or that such details were not documented in the available entries. Therefore, without further information, it is reasonable to estimate that the case was likely of modest monetary value, possibly under \$50,000.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover is listed as a party in the case, but there is no indication of his role as either Plaintiff or Defendant in the docket entries provided. The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated on February 17, 2006, but without additional context or specific allegations, it cannot be definitively stated which party he represents. The presence of another party, Kristine Nicole Branthoover, suggests that further investigation into the relationship between the two may clarify the roles.

Status: The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and was terminated on February 17, 2006. Since the case has a termination date, it indicates that the case has finished and been officially closed.

Background: The docket indicates that a case was filed on October 6, 2005, but there are no details regarding the cause of action or factual background provided in the entries. The case was terminated just a few months later, on February 17, 2006, suggesting a swift resolution, yet the absence of additional context leaves the specifics of the complaint unclear.

Motion practice: The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated on February 17, 2006, with no substantive docket entries indicating motion practice or developments during its brief lifespan. Daniel Kenneth Branthoover, listed as a party, lacks legal representation as no counsel is associated with him in the docket, leaving his role and involvement in the case ambiguous, particularly in relation to co-party Kristine Nicole Branthoover. The absence of motion activity suggests a lack of procedural engagement or potential withdrawal from the case by the parties involved.

Duration: The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated on February 17, 2006, lasting a total of 4 months and 11 days. This duration reflects the time taken from the initiation of the legal proceedings to their conclusion.

Outcome: The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and was subsequently terminated on February 17, 2006. The docket entries indicate a swift resolution, with no further details provided about the nature of the termination or any outcomes resulting from the case. This suggests that the matter was either settled, dismissed, or resolved through other means without further litigation. The lack of additional entries implies a closure without extended proceedings or appeals.

Complexity: The case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated less than four months later on February 17, 2006. The brief duration and lack of additional entries suggest that the case was likely straightforward, possibly resolved through a settlement or dismissal without extensive litigation. The absence of complexity is indicated by the quick resolution and minimal procedural activity.

Experts: The docket entries show that Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine Nicole Branthoover were parties in the case filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated on February 17, 2006, but there are no counsel associated with either party, raising questions about their legal representation and involvement in the proceedings. Additionally, the docket does not indicate the involvement of any experts in the case, further obscuring the circumstances surrounding the parties' roles.

Monetary value: The docket indicates that the case was filed on October 6, 2005, and terminated shortly thereafter on February 17, 2006. However, there are no specific monetary amounts mentioned in the docket entries, making it impossible to determine the financial size of the case precisely. Given the short duration and lack of detailed information, it may be inferred that the case was likely of a modest monetary value, possibly involving small claims or preliminary matters. Without specific figures, a rough estimate could suggest a range under \$50,000.

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

Extract

Summary

Role: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover served as the Petitioner in the case, as indicated by the docket entries. The case involved a divorce proceeding where he initiated the action against Kristine N Branthoover, who is identified as the Respondent. The final decree of divorce was issued, closing the case in favor of the parties involved.

Status: The case has been concluded, as indicated by the Final Order/Judgment/Decree dated February 22, 2011, which closes the entire case. The case status is marked as "Inactive: Disposed," confirming that it has been officially closed and no further action is pending. The last relevant entries date back to 2011, indicating no recent activity.

Background: The cause of action in this case is a divorce, initiated by the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce on December 3, 2010, by Daniel Kenneth Branthoover against Kristine N. Branthoover. The case culminated in a Final Decree of Divorce issued on February 22, 2011, which closed the case. A Waiver of Service or Citation was filed on December 13, 2010, indicating that the defendant was aware of the proceedings.

Motion practice: Daniel Kenneth Branthoover initiated the divorce proceedings against Kristine N Branthoover by filing an Original Petition for Divorce on December 3, 2010, shortly followed by a Case Information Sheet. On December 13, 2010, he executed a Waiver of Service or Citation, indicating an agreement to proceed without formal service, which streamlined the process. The case culminated in a Final Decree of Divorce issued by Judge Douglas Robison on February 22, 2011, effectively closing the matter and reflecting the conclusion of the legal proceedings initiated by Branthoover.

Duration: The case lasted from December 3, 2010, when the Original Petition for Divorce was filed, until February 22, 2011, when the Final Order/Judgment was issued, resulting in a total duration of approximately 2 months and 19 days. The case was subsequently closed on March 2, 2011, with the issuance of the Certified Copy of Final Order, but the primary proceedings concluded with the Final Decree on February 22.

Outcome: The case concluded with the issuance of a Final Decree of Divorce on February 22, 2011, between Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine N Branthoover, effectively closing the matter. The certified copy of the final order was sent to the defendant on March 2, 2011, alongside a form mailed to the Bureau of Vital Statistics. The case has since been marked as inactive and disposed, with all relevant documents filed and archived in records management as of November 14, 2011.

Complexity: The case is a divorce with children, indicating potential complexities regarding custody and support arrangements. The docket entries reflect a relatively straightforward process, with key documents like the Original Petition for Divorce and Final Decree filed without indication of contested issues or extended litigation. The timeline shows a closure of the case within a few months, suggesting a streamlined resolution. Overall, while the presence of children adds some complexity, the case appears to have been managed efficiently with minimal complications.

Experts: There is no indication in the docket entries that any experts were involved in the divorce case between Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine N Branthoover. The proceedings included the filing of an Original Petition for Divorce and a waiver of service, culminating in a Final Decree of Divorce issued by Douglas Robison, but no expert testimony or reports are mentioned.

Monetary value: The docket entries indicate that this case involved a divorce proceeding between Daniel Kenneth Branthoover and Kristine N. Branthoover, culminating in a final decree of divorce on February 22, 2011. However, there are no specific monetary claims or financial settlements mentioned in the entries, suggesting that the financial aspects of the case, if any, are not detailed in the provided docket. As such, it is difficult to estimate the monetary value of the case, but typically, divorce cases can involve assets or support obligations that might range from a few thousand to several hundred thousand dollars, depending on the circumstances.