

CAUSE NO. DC-25-22164

ANTHONY SAUNDERS AND TAKEISHA	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
SAUNDERS, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS PARENTS	§	
AND NEXT FRIENDS OF L.S., A MINOR CHILD,	§	
	§	
PLAINTIFFS,	§	
	§	DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS
VS.	§	
	§	
GALAXY RANCH SCHOOL, LP D/B/A GALAXY	§	
RANCH PRIVATE SCHOOL; and GALAXY RANCH	§	
GP, LLC D/B/A GALAXY RANCH PRIVATE SCHOOL	§	
	§	
DEFENDANTS.	§	<u>193rd</u> JUDICIAL DISTRICT

ORIGINAL PETITION AND JURY DEMAND

1. Anthony ("Tony") and Takeisha ("Keisha") Saunders are United States Army Veterans and working parents that relied on a daycare to provide a safe, caring, and nurturing environment for their son, L.S. Tony and Keisha Saunders trusted that their three-year-old son would be safe at Galaxy Ranch.¹ Instead, their worst nightmares became a reality when their son suffered a skull fracture, a brain bleed, and a traumatic brain injury when he was inappropriately handled and aggressively disciplined by an overwhelmed Galaxy Ranch caregiver. Tony and Keisha Saunders bring this lawsuit on their family's behalf asking that Galaxy Ranch accept responsibility for the serious physical, emotional, mental, and psychological injuries their family has suffered because of the failures of Galaxy Ranch.

¹ This petition refers to Defendants Galaxy Ranch School, LP d/b/a Galaxy Ranch Private School; and Galaxy Ranch GP, LLC d/b/a Galaxy Ranch Private School collectively as "Galaxy Ranch," owned and managed by Bradford and Alicia Larsen, located at 1835 TL Townsend Drive, Rockwall, Texas 75032, operating under Texas Child Care Operation License number 866401.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

2. Tony and Keisha are both United States Army Veterans who served our country in active duty. Keisha is an active member of the United States Army Reserves. Both Tony and Keisha are full-time working parents of three young children. The Saunders family chose Galaxy Ranch because of what they had to offer – the daycare had surveillance cameras, came with several word-of-mouth recommendations and good reviews, and promised to provide an educational environment. Galaxy Ranch promised parents that they have “an experienced staff,” and their focus is to provide children with “the best possible start in life.”² Galaxy Ranch claimed to understand that a child’s learning process is shaped by their experiences within various environments and settings.³ Galaxy Ranch promised educational development through discovery.⁴ However, when three-year-old L.S. curiously tapped his foot in spilled milk, any hope for the best possible start in life was taken from him when his overwhelmed Galaxy Ranch caregiver responded with inappropriate discipline.

3. Galaxy Ranch is responsible for qualifying, hiring, training, and supervising its employee caregivers on providing safe and proper care conducive to the welfare of the children, appropriate discipline methods, the use of self-control, proper documentation of incidents of injury, appropriate action to take in the event of a medical emergency, and compliance with Texas’ minimum standards for childcare. Galaxy Ranch is also responsible for ensuring that it has enough caregivers in each classroom to provide a safe environment for the children.

² Galaxy Ranch Private School Website, “Values” page, www.galaxyranhprivateschool.com/values/, and “Philosophy” page, www.galaxyranhprivateschool.com/philosophy/, 2024.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

4. On Wednesday, March 27, 2024, Tony dropped off their three-year-old son L.S. at Galaxy Ranch for daycare. On this day, the three-year-old Preschool Classroom #6 was at maximum capacity per Texas' requirements on child-to-caregiver ratio, with one Galaxy Ranch caregiver, 20-year-old Jaeden Grace Leslie, in charge of 10 three-year-old kids. Ms. Leslie was hired in December of 2023, just three months before.

5. Preschool Classroom #6 shares a conjoining bathroom with Preschool Classroom #7. The conjoining bathroom allows passage from Classroom #6 and Classroom #7. Surveillance footage shows that at 11:34am, L.S. and other kids were seated at a table eating when another child spilled some milk on the floor. The Galaxy Ranch caregiver saw the milk on the floor and sends the child that spilled the milk to Classroom #7 through the conjoining classroom door. L.S., being the typical 3-year-old child, began tapping his foot in spilled milk on the floor.

6. At 11:36am, the Galaxy Ranch caregiver gets up from where she is sitting and proceeds to move stacked sleeping cots with her left hand while using her right hand to abruptly grab L.S. him by the arm. The Galaxy Ranch caregiver then yanks L.S. out of his seat, knocking his chair over, then pulls him across the empty seat next to him, pushing it out of place, heading toward the bathroom area and out of the view of the camera.

7. The Galaxy Ranch caregiver admitted that she pulled L.S. by the arm to the time-out chair located on the wall directly in front of the bathroom door. While putting him into the chair, L.S.'s head struck the *open* bathroom door. L.S. began crying and asking to go home. Despite being aware that he had struck his head, the Galaxy Ranch caregiver admitted that she turned her back to L.S., took a deep breath to calm down and went on to completing other tasks – ignoring L.S.'s cries, claiming she didn't know L.S. was injured like he was until later. Despite the classrooms

being conjoined, the other caregivers claimed to not have heard L.S.'s cries. Text messages recovered later by the state licensing investigators reveal just how questionable this claim is when later that evening the Galaxy Ranch caregiver texted another caregiver saying, "...and you would've heard a scream."

8. The Galaxy Ranch caregiver then comes back into view of the camera *without* L.S. A few minutes later, L.S. comes back into the view of the camera, visibly upset and crying as he walks to his nap cot, lays down, and grabs his head. L.S. lays on his cot, crying and grabbing his head, for several minutes.

9. While L.S. lays on the cot crying and grabbing his head, the Galaxy Ranch caregiver covers him with a blanket from head to toe. Every time L.S. would try to uncover himself, the caregiver would come back over to him and cover his entire body again — continuing to ignore his distressed cries for help. At 12:06pm, 30 minutes after L.S.'s head struck the bathroom door, the Galaxy Ranch caregiver is seen covering L.S. again, but this time she pauses, taking a moment to look at him as though she realized there was something seriously wrong. At some point between laying down, crying, holding his head, and being repeatedly covered by a blanket when trying to uncover himself – L.S. had thrown up on his cot.

10. Almost 20 minutes later, the Galaxy Ranch caregiver approaches L.S. again, kneeling to his cot. According to her own statement, she noticed L.S. laying there with his eyes open and told him to close them. When he did not respond, she attempted to shut his eyes with her own hands, but they reopened. The Galaxy Ranch caregiver lifts him up and turns his body around on the cot, laying his head on the opposite end of the cot from where he threw up – his head is seen falling back, his body limp.

11. The Galaxy Ranch caregiver realizes L.S. is having a seizure. Camera footage shows her walk over to the intercom to page for assistance. When Ms. Mindi White, Galaxy Ranch Director, arrived in the classroom and observed L.S.'s condition, she ran to the intercom to tell another caregiver to call 911. The Galaxy Ranch Director then picked L.S. up, took him to the front, and called Tony Saunders. Tony and Keisha were at Galaxy Ranch within minutes of receiving that dreaded phone call.

12. While in the front office, L.S. was unresponsive and unable to blink, with his eyes wide open and rolled back. By the time EMS arrived at 12:33pm, it had been approximately *one hour since L.S.'s head struck the bathroom door*. When EMS arrived, three-year-old L.S. was carried out of Galaxy Ranch by Rockwall Fire Department to the ambulance. He was unconscious with labored breathing and continued seizure activity. EMS paramedics had to use a bag-valve-mask (BVM) on L.S. during transport. A BVM is a manual resuscitation device used to provide positive pressure ventilation, forcing air into the lungs when a patient is unable to breathe effectively on their own due to respiratory distress or arrest.

13. L.S. was transported via ambulance to a nearby hospital where CT scans determined the severity of his injuries – **three-year-old L.S. had suffered a displaced left temporal skull fracture and bilateral temporal and parietal lobe subarachnoid hemorrhage**. L.S. was then care-flighted to an acute care hospital in Dallas where he was admitted into the pediatric intensive care unit (PICU). L.S. remained in the hospital for multiple days as his parents sat by his side praying that their child survived.



14. An independent investigation into the Incident by the Texas Health and Human Services Commission Child-Care Licensing Division and the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services was performed, concluding that Galaxy Ranch violated the Texas Child Care Safety Laws in relation to the incident involving L.S.:

- **746.1201(4) – Failing to Ensure That No Child is Abused, Neglected, or Exploited.**
- **746.2805(3) – Using a Prohibited Punishment Method, Grabbing and Pulling.** *The Galaxy Ranch caregiver utilized inappropriate discipline by pulling a child across the floor by their arm and placed the child in a chair with enough force to cause the child to hit their head and sustain serious head injuries.*

15. Galaxy Ranch is responsible for ensuring that the caregivers they employ are fit for the job, properly trained, and adequately supervised. The Preschool Classroom #6 was at maximum capacity on the date of incident with 10 three-year-old children being watched by one caregiver. The Galaxy Ranch caregiver was hired in December of 2023, just three months before the

incident on March 27, 2024. During those three months of employment, Galaxy Ranch had received *at least* one complaint about Ms. Leslie's behavior toward children. According to Alicia Larsen, owner of Galaxy Ranch, in January of 2024, she had received a report from another teacher regarding Ms. Leslie using a loud tone with the children. Yet, when questioned by a state licensing investigator, the Galaxy Ranch owner could not recall *when* the complaint was made *or* who made it. The actions and omissions of Galaxy Ranch beg the questions: Why wasn't the complaint documented? Why wasn't there any corrective training? Why wasn't there any action taken to ensure this caregiver was fit for the job? Why would Galaxy Ranch put a caregiver with just three months experience alone in a classroom at maximum capacity with such an active age group? Why didn't the Galaxy Ranch Director do any drop-in observation on the classroom during the entire morning of March 27, 2024?

16. Galaxy Ranch had surveillance cameras installed throughout the classrooms in the daycare. However, the camera angles had blind spots, and those spots were known to Galaxy Ranch and its employees. Despite knowing there were blind spots, Galaxy Ranch allowed its caregivers to place a "time-out" chair within the blind spot of Preschool Classroom #6. It is in this blind spot where L.S. was placed in the time-out chair, striking his head on the bathroom door – begging the questions: Why would Galaxy Ranch allow the time-out chair to be placed in a spot where no one could see what happens? Why weren't the cameras monitored to ensure that they were capturing all interactions between employees and children? Why weren't the classrooms and employees supervised to ensure discipline occurred in an appropriate spot?

17. Tony and Keisha Saunders bring this case in search of answers to these questions. But the one thing that *is* clear is that what happened to L.S. was preventable. As a direct and

proximate result of the actions and omissions of Galaxy Ranch, L.S. suffered life-threatening injuries that have physically, emotionally, psychologically, and mentally changed his life forever.

DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN & CLAIM FOR RELIEF

18. Discovery in this matter is intended to be conducted under Level 3 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

19. As required by the Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 47(c), Plaintiffs' counsel states that Plaintiffs seek monetary relief over \$1,000,000.00; however, the amount of monetary relief awarded will ultimately be determined by a jury.

PARTIES

20. Plaintiffs Anthony Saunders and Takeisha Saunders are the biological parents of Plaintiff L.S., a minor, and are citizens and residents of Rockwall County, Texas.

21. Defendant Galaxy Ranch School, LP d/b/a Galaxy Ranch Private School (herein referred to as "Defendant(s)" or "Galaxy Ranch") is a corporation doing business in the State of Texas, its state of formation. Defendant operates a daycare located at 1835 TL Townsend Drive, Rockwall, Texas 75032, under Texas Child Care Operation License Number 866401. Defendant's principal place of business is 2101 Firewheel Parkway, Garland, Texas 75040. Defendant may be served with process by serving its registered agent, Bradford L. Larsen, located at 2101 Firewheel Parkway, Garland, Texas 75040 or wherever they may be found.

22. Defendant Galaxy Ranch GP, LLC d/b/a Galaxy Ranch Private School (herein referred to as "Defendant(s)" or "Galaxy Ranch") is a limited liability company doing business in the State of Texas, its state of formation. Defendant operates a daycare located at 1835 TL Townsend Drive, Rockwall, Texas 75032, under Texas Child Care Operation License Number 866401.

Defendant's principal place of business is 2101 Firewheel Parkway, Garland, Texas 75040. Defendant may be served with process by serving its registered agent, Bradford L. Larsen, located at 2101 Firewheel Parkway, Garland, Texas 75040 or wherever they may be found.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

23. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this lawsuit because the amount in controversy exceeds this Court's minimum jurisdictional requirements.

24. Venue is proper in Dallas County, Texas, under Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code Section 15.002(a) because this is the county where Defendants' principal office is located.

CAUSES OF ACTION

Count One – Negligence

25. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as if stated fully herein.

26. The occurrence made the basis of this suit, reflected in the above paragraphs, and the resulting injuries and damages of Plaintiffs were proximately caused by the negligent conduct of the Defendants. Defendants were negligent by breaching the duty that was owed to Plaintiffs, to exercise ordinary care in one or more of the following acts or omissions, constituting negligence:

- a. Failing to exercise the care that was necessary under the circumstances;
- b. Failing to do what a reasonable daycare would have done under the circumstances;
- c. Failing properly supervise the children in their care;
- d. Failing to intervene to ensure a child's safety;
- e. Failing to maintain a safe environment for children;
- f. Choosing to inappropriately discipline minor Plaintiff L.S.;

- g. Failing to ensure that expectations for a child's behavior is appropriate or the developmental level of that child;
 - h. Failing to use only constructive, age-appropriate methods of discipline;
 - i. Failing to train its employees on the use of appropriate methods of discipline;
 - j. Failing to properly and safely redirect children in their care;
 - k. Failing to properly hire, qualify, train, and supervise its employee-caregivers trusted with the care of minor Plaintiff L.S.;
 - l. Failing to appropriately respond in an emergency situation;
 - m. Failing to use positive methods of discipline and guidance with the children in its care;
 - n. Failing to ensure caregiver employees demonstrate competency, good judgment, and self-control; and
 - o. Failing to adhere to the Texas Minimum Standards for Childcare.
27. Defendants had a duty to exercise ordinary care in caring for, supervising, and disciplining the children in its care so as to prevent injury to Plaintiff L.S. and other children similarly situated.
28. Defendants had a duty to maintain a safe environment for children in its care so as to prevent injury to L.S., and other children similarly situated.
29. Defendants had a duty to hire, train, and supervise employees to ensure that children were not subjected to inappropriate discipline, so as to prevent injury to L.S., and other children similarly situated.
30. Defendants breached the duty of care by failing to properly care for the children; failing to properly supervise the children; failing to appropriately discipline the children; failing to

properly train, hire, and supervise its employees; and failing to maintain a safe environment for children.

31. Defendants' negligent acts and/or omissions, and breach of duties, directly and proximately caused injury to Plaintiffs, which resulted in significant damages.

Count Two – Negligence Per Se

32. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as if stated fully herein.

33. Defendants failed to exercise the mandatory standard of care in violation of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, Minimum Standards for Child-Care.

34. In the foregoing claims of negligence per se, Plaintiffs were, at all times, members of the class that the statutes the Defendants violated were designed to protect.

35. Defendants' violation of the statutes was the proximate cause of the incident in question.

36. As a result of the Defendants' acts and/or omissions in violating the statutes, Plaintiffs sustained damages.

Count Three – Gross Negligence

37. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as if stated fully herein.

38. Defendants' conduct was more than momentary thoughtlessness or inadvertence. Rather, the acts and/or omissions by Defendants in the preceding paragraphs constitute gross negligence as that term is defined in Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code §41.001(11).

39. Defendants' conduct involved an extreme degree of risk, considering the probability and magnitude of potential harm to the Plaintiffs. Defendants had actual, subjective awareness of the risk involved, but, nevertheless, proceeded in conscious indifference to the rights, safety, or welfare of Plaintiffs or of others similarly situated.

40. The above acts and/or omissions were singularly and cumulatively the proximate cause of the occurrence in question and the resulting injuries and damage sustained by Plaintiffs.

Count Four – Negligent Activity

41. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as if stated fully herein.

42. Defendants are the owners, operators, and/or possessors of the daycare premises located at 1835 T L Townsend Drive, Rockwall, Texas 75032, operation license number 866401.

43. At the time of the Incident, L.S. was a minor child placed in the care of Defendants and was thus an “invitee” to whom Defendants owed a duty to exercise ordinary care.

44. Plaintiffs’ injuries were the direct and contemporaneous result of Defendants’ ongoing negligent activity on the premises at the time of the injuries and damages sustained.

45. Defendants owed Plaintiffs a legal duty to ensure L.S.’s safety in maintaining proper care over the children; ensuring discipline over the children is appropriate; ensuring safe nap time procedures are utilized; ensuring staff respond to injuries appropriately; and ensuring that employees are necessarily hired, trained, supervised, and terminated in order to maintain a safe environment for children. Defendants breached these duties by permitting one of its employee-caregivers to inappropriately discipline children, ignore the child’s serious injuries, practice unsafe naptime procedures, and by allowing that caregiver to remain on staff after the Incident.

46. Such negligent activity on the part of the Defendant proximately caused the injuries and other damages suffered by Plaintiffs.

RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR

47. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as if stated fully herein.

48. The negligence, carelessness, and callousness of Defendants' employees proximately caused the damage and losses suffered by Plaintiffs as a result of the injury. At all times material to this action, Defendants' employees were acting in the course and scope of their employment. Accordingly, Defendants may be held responsible for its employees' negligence under the doctrine of respondeat superior.

DAMAGES

49. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as if stated fully herein.

50. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' negligent acts and/or omissions, Plaintiffs Anthony Saunders and Takeisha Saunders, individually, and as Parents and Next Friends of Plaintiff L.S., a minor child, suffered damages and injuries that include, but are not limited to:

- a. Physical pain and suffering in the past;
- b. Physical pain and suffering, in reasonable probability, sustained in the future;
- c. Mental anguish in the past;
- d. Mental anguish, in reasonable probability, sustained in the future;
- e. Reasonable and necessary medical expenses in the past;
- f. Reasonable and necessary medical expenses, in reasonable probability, sustained in the future;
- g. Loss of wages in the past;
- h. Loss of wages, in reasonable probability, sustained in the future;
- i. Loss of wage-earning capacity in the past;
- j. Loss of wage-earning capacity, in reasonable probability, sustained in the future;

- k. Physical impairment in the past;
 - l. Physical impairment, in reasonable probability, sustained in the future;
 - m. Loss of the normal enjoyment of the pleasure of life in the past;
 - n. Loss of the normal enjoyment of the pleasure of life, in reasonable probability, sustained in the future;
 - o. Costs of suit; and
 - p. All other relief, in law and equity, to which Plaintiffs may be entitled.
51. Plaintiffs' damages clearly exceed the minimum jurisdictional requirements for this Court. Plaintiffs, therefore, seek compensation by the Court and jury for their damages, in an amount to be determined by the jury.

EXEMPLARY DAMAGES

52. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as if stated fully herein.
53. Plaintiffs would further show that the acts and/or omissions of the Defendants complained of herein were committed knowingly, willfully, intentionally, with actual awareness, and with the specific and predetermined intention of enriching said Defendants at the expense of Plaintiffs.
54. The grossly negligent conduct of Defendants, as described herein, constitutes conduct for which the law allows the imposition of exemplary damages. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek the award of exemplary damages against Defendants pursuant to Chapter 41 of the Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code.

JURY TRIAL

55. Plaintiffs demand a jury trial and have tendered the appropriate fee with the filing of this Original Petition.

U.S. LIFE TABLES

56. Notice is hereby given that Plaintiffs intend to use the U.S. Life Tables as prepared by the Department of Health and Human Services.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Plaintiffs pray that Defendants be cited to appear and answer herein and upon final hearing hereof, they take, have and recover, of and from said Defendants, the above damages, exemplary damages, costs of court, pre-judgment interest, post-judgment interest, and for such other and further relief to which they may show themselves justly entitled.

Dated: December 1, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

THE BUTTON LAW FIRM

By: /s/Russell T. Button

Russell T. Button

Texas Bar No. 24077428

russell@buttonlawfirm.com

Ashley D. Knarr

Texas Bar No. 24102030

ashley@buttonawfirm.com

Kaitlyn Moreno

Texas Bar No. 24125670

kaitlyn@buttonlawfirm.com

Rena Piper

Texas Bar No. 24120428

rena@buttonlawfirm.com

4315 W. Lovers Lane, Suite A
Dallas, Texas 75209
T: 214-888-2216
F: 214-481-8667
Email for Service:
service@buttonlawfirm.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

Automated Certificate of eService

This automated certificate of service was created by the eFiling system. The filer served this document via email generated by the eFiling system on the date and to the persons listed below. The rules governing certificates of service have not changed. Filers must still provide a certificate of service that complies with all applicable rules.

Russell Button on behalf of Russell Button

Bar No. 24077428

service@buttonlawfirm.com

Envelope ID: 108559488

Filing Code Description: Original Petition

Filing Description:

Status as of 12/2/2025 10:00 AM CST

Case Contacts

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Ashley Washington		ashley@buttonlawfirm.com	12/1/2025 12:54:10 PM	SENT
Russell Button		service@buttonlawfirm.com	12/1/2025 12:54:10 PM	SENT
Russell Button		russell@buttonlawfirm.com	12/1/2025 12:54:10 PM	SENT