

DC-26-01702

CAUSE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

JAMUS HERNANDEZ AND ALEZANDRA § IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF  
HERNANDEZ, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS PARENTS §  
AND NEXT FRIENDS OF J.H., A MINOR CHILD; §  
CALEB BRIAN AND LIANFEI BRIAN, §  
INDIVIDUALLY AND AS PARENTS AND NEXT §  
FRIENDS OF E.B., A MINOR CHILD; EMORY §  
SHOWALTER AND HANNAH SHOWALTER, §  
INDIVIDUALLY AND AS PARENTS AND NEXT §  
FRIENDS OF O.S., A MINOR CHILD; SAGE BAKER §  
AND AMANDA TABOR, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS §  
PARENTS AND NEXT FRIENDS OF R.B., A MINOR §  
CHILD; AND JAMES KIRK AND MACKENZI KIRK, §  
INDIVIDUALLY AND AS PARENTS AND NEXT §  
FRIENDS OF C.K., A MINOR CHILD, §  
§  
PLAINTIFFS, §  
§  
VS. §  
§  
CAMDEN HILL, LLC D/B/A CAMDEN HILL § 191st  
MONTESSORI; AND MELISSA RODRIGUEZ, §  
§  
DEFENDANTS. § \_\_\_\_\_ JUDICIAL DISTRICT

---

ORIGINAL PETITION AND JURY DEMAND

---

1. Plaintiffs Jamus and Alezandra Hernandez, Caleb and Lianfei Brian, Emory and Hannah Showalter, Sage Baker and Amanda Tabor, and James and Mackenzi Kirk are working parents of one-year-old children that relied on Camden Hill Montessori to provide a safe, caring, and nurturing environment for their kids while they were working.<sup>1</sup> Their worst nightmares became

---

<sup>1</sup> This Petition refers to Defendant Camden Hill, LLC d/b/a Camden Hill Montessori as "Camden Hill," or "Camden Hill Montessori," a daycare owned and operated by Dr. Regina Crone, located at 2020 E. Hebron Parkway, Suite 130, Carrollton, Texas 75007, operating under Texas Child Care Operation License number 1595944.

a reality when it was discovered their children had been subjected to months of inappropriate discipline and mistreatment by their Camden Hill caregiver. These parents bring this lawsuit on behalf of their families asking that Camden Hill accept responsibility for the serious physical, emotional, mental, and psychological injuries their children have suffered.

### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

2. Camden Hill's executive director and founder, Dr. Regina Crone, presented parents with a carefully crafted image of a Montessori school that promised a safe, nurturing, and superior educational environment—one designed to help each child "maximize his or her potential through exploration and curiosity."<sup>2</sup> That image was reinforced by assurances that Camden Hill hires "the very best teachers," described as nurturing, well-qualified, passionate educators who demonstrated daily enthusiasm for teaching.<sup>3</sup>

3. Parents were promised a classroom community that embraced each child's individual needs, fostered self-confidence, and guided children through challenges with patience and encouragement.<sup>4</sup> Camden Hill assured families that its caregivers used a balanced approach to guidance and care, always considering and nurturing each child's unique interests and strengths.<sup>5</sup> The daycare publicly promoted values of social responsibility, integrity, and excellence, holding itself out as an institution dedicated to kindness and honesty—"even when no one is watching."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *Camden Hill Montessori Website*, "About Us" page, [www.camdenhill.com/about-us/](http://www.camdenhill.com/about-us/), 2025.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Camden Hill Montessori Website*, [www.camdenhill.com](http://www.camdenhill.com), 2025.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> *Camden Hill Montessori Website*, "About Us" page, [www.camdenhill.com/about-us/](http://www.camdenhill.com/about-us/), 2025.

4. Based on these representations, parents reasonably believed their children would be safe, nurtured, and properly cared for. Unbeknownst to them, however, they were sending their children each day into an environment marked not by integrity and care, but by dishonesty, cruelty, and a profound lack of patience.

5. Camden Hill broke its promises when it allowed its caregiver, Melissa Rodriguez, to repeatedly and excessively mistreat toddlers — one-year-olds too young to speak for or protect themselves — over the course of several months. This mistreatment included inappropriate discipline and aggressive handling, occurring under Camden Hill's watch and in direct contradiction to the values and assurances it used to gain parents' trust.

6. Camden Hill is responsible for qualifying, hiring, training, and supervising its employees 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, intervening as to prevent injury or harm to a child, and compliance with the Child Safety Laws set forth in Texas' Minimum Standards for Child Care. Camden Hill is also responsible for ensuring situations that place a child at risk of harm are reported to childcare licensing authorities.

7. On Monday, June 9, 2025, at approximately 3:00 p.m., Alezandra Hernandez, mother of 16-month-old J.H., received a phone call from Camden Hill telling her that J.H. had been injured, was "sitting weird," and was refusing to put any weight on his leg. No sense of urgency was conveyed — only vague reassurances and a cover-up story that another toddler had pushed J.H. while he was playing, causing him to fall onto a toy.

8. When Alezandra Hernandez arrived to pick up J.H., she was confronted with a far more alarming reality. J.H. was noticeably in pain. He could not stand or walk on his clearly injured leg.

Camden Hill produced an incident report repeating the same account, falsely claiming the injury was the result of ordinary everyday toddler play.

9. Alezandra Hernandez took J.H. to the emergency room where he was diagnosed with a severe contusion to his right leg. He was unable to walk for the remainder of that day and the following day, and he continued to walk with a noticeable limp for several days after. Deeply concerned with the severity of the incident, Jamus and Alezandra Hernandez requested that Camden Hill show them the video footage of the incident.

10. Camden Hill reviewed the video footage before allowing Jamus and Alezandra Hernandez to see it. The daycare was initially reluctant to let J.H.'s parents view the footage, admitting only that they observed conduct that did not follow their policies and procedures.

11. Jamus and Alezandra Hernandez were persistent – this is their son and they had the right to view the footage themselves. After numerous requests and a report to childcare licensing authorities, Camden Hill finally showed them the footage. The truth began to surface and that single video was only the beginning. What they saw left them horrified.

12. The video footage revealed that Camden Hill's account of what had occurred was entirely fabricated. The injury to 16-month-old J.H. was *not* caused by another toddler or by a harmless fall during play as they had been told. Instead, it was caused by a Camden Hill caregiver entrusted with his safety — a caregiver Camden Hill was responsible for hiring, training, and supervising. A caregiver Camden Hill had described as one of "the very best, nurturing, well-qualified, and passionate," teacher.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Camden Hill Montessori Website, "About Us" page, [www.camdenhill.com/about-us/](http://www.camdenhill.com/about-us/), 2025.

13. The footage showed J.H. climbing onto a changing table when Camden Hill's caregiver, Melissa Rodriguez, intervened — but not with the care and patience she owed J.H. She grabbed J.H. by one arm, lifted his full body weight by that arm, carried him across the room suspended by only his arm, and then dropped him to the floor, releasing her grip from chest height. J.H. was dropped to the hard floor without protection, immediately resulting in his injury. The Camden Hill caregiver then repeated this same action with another child, ignoring J.H. as he cried out in pain.

14. What began as an investigation into the injury of *one* toddler quickly unraveled into the exposure of an enormous and serious systemic failure of Camden Hill. Five days of classroom footage were reviewed, revealing more than **140 separate instances of inappropriate discipline and aggressive mishandling of toddlers perpetrated by two Camden Hill caregivers.**

15. The investigation revealed that *two* caregivers Camden Hill was responsible for hiring, training, and supervising — Melissa Rodriguez and her co-teacher, Perla Rodriguez — subjected J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B, C.K., and several other defenseless one-year-old toddlers to conduct that is nothing short of appalling:

- Yanking toddlers up by their arms and tossing or dropping them.
- Slamming toddlers against walls, floors, and changing tables.
- Throwing shoes at toddlers.
- Pinching toddlers.
- Pulling their hair.
- Stepping on toddlers.
- Spanking toddlers.
- Yelling at toddlers.
- Grabbing toddlers by their heads and shirts and pulling them upward.
- Covering toddlers' mouths as they cried out in distress.
- Falsifying incident reports to conceal inappropriate discipline.

16. Video footage spanning just five days confirmed that the second Camden Hill caregiver, Perla Rodriguez, was present for – and failed to intervene – during at *least 14* instances of mistreatment inflicted on the toddler class. Camden Hill’s caregiver, Perla Rodriguez, stood by and watched as Melissa Rodriguez was seen:

- Grabbing O.S. by the arm and tossing him to the ground.
- Picking up O.S. and R.B. by one arm and slinging them down.
- Swinging J.H. up to the changing table by one arm and slamming him down.
- Aggressively handling J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B, and C.K.
- Picking up J.H. and another child and slinging them down to the ground.
- Forcefully pushing C.K. against the wall and stepping on his feet.
- Dropping E.B. to the ground causing her to hit her head on a trashcan.
- Dragging R.B. to the changing table, throwing him, and forcefully pinning him down.

17. In one instance, video footage shows Camden Hill’s caregiver, Perla Rodriguez, actively *participating* in the mistreatment: **Camden Hill’s Melissa Rodriguez asks her co-teacher, Perla Rodriguez, to hand her a shoe so that she could throw it at a child. Rather than intervene, Perla Rodriguez hands Camden Hill’s Melissa Rodriguez the shoe to throw.**

18. The Texas Health and Human Services Commission Child-Care Licensing Division and the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services conducted their own independent investigation into Camden Hill’s childcare operation and the mistreatment these toddlers were subjected to. After speaking with parents, observing the video footage, forensically interviewing the children, and interviewing Camden Hill management and staff, the state concluded that Camden Hill violated *numerous* Texas Child Care Safety Laws.

19. Texas Health and Human Services Commission, Child-Care Licensing Division and the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services issued Camden Hill several citations for the violation of Texas Child Care Safety Laws:

- **§746.2805 – Using a Prohibited Punishment Method, Harsh and Cruel Language:** It was found that the Camden Hill caregivers used harsh redirection language toward the children in her care.
- **§746.2805(1) – Using a Prohibited Punishment Method, Corporal Punishment:** It was found that Camden Hill caregivers used corporal punishment toward a child by spanking, throwing a shoe at a child, and slamming a child against a changing table.
- **§746.2805(3) – Using a Prohibited Punishment Method, Grabbing and Pulling:** It was found that Camden Hill caregivers used prohibited punishment on a child by grabbing children by the head, and by the shirt and pulling them upward in a chair.
- **§746.2805(5) – Using a Prohibited Punishment Method, Humiliating, Ridiculing, Rejecting, or Yelling:** It was found that Camden Hill caregivers used prohibited punishment toward children by yelling at them.
- **§746.305(a)(6) – Failing to Report a Situation Placing Children at Risk of Injury:** It was found that Camden Hill was aware of an incident that placed a child at risk and did not notify Child Care Licensing.
- **§746.1205(a)(5) – Failing to Intervene to Ensure a Child’s Safety:** It was found that the Camden Hill caregivers did not intervene when inappropriate discipline was used towards children by another caregiver.
- **§746.1201(1) – Failing to Demonstrate Competency, Good Judgment, and Self-Control:** It was found that the Camden Hill caregiver did not demonstrate self-control towards children within the classroom. The caregiver grabbed and carried children by one arm to place them in their chair and to move them across the classroom. The caregiver slammed children into a seated position onto the floor. The caregiver did not demonstrate good judgment by falsifying incident reports regarding how children were injured.
- **§746.1201(5) – Failing to Report Suspected Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation:** It was found that Camden Hill failed to make the mandatory report of suspected abuse or neglect.
- **§746.1201(4) – Failing to Ensure That No Child is Abused, Neglected, or Exploited:** It was found that Camden Hill failed to ensure that the children they were trusted with were not abused, neglected or exploited.

20. Camden Hill is responsible for ensuring that the caregivers they employ are fit for the job, properly trained, and properly supervised at all times. When interviewed by the state about the incidents that had taken place in the classroom, Camden Hill's caregiver, Melissa Rodriguez, admitted that she had been treating the toddlers in the classroom poorly since she began working at Camden Hill.

21. Camden Hill had surveillance cameras installed throughout its classrooms yet failed to notice over 140 instances of aggressive handling and inappropriate discipline in just a five-day period — along with the months-long pattern of this same behavior and treatment.

22. Why were the cameras not actively monitored? Why were classrooms not supervised? Why were Camden Hill caregivers allowed to continue the inappropriate discipline and aggressive mishandling of the defenseless toddlers in their care? The cameras, like so many other assurances made by Camden Hill, served only as empty promises—creating a false sense of security while children suffered behind closed doors.

23. **The simple truth is: Camden Hill failed these children.** No meaningful monitoring occurred. No intervention took place. No protection was provided.

24. Plaintiffs bring this action seeking accountability for these failures. What is indisputable is this: the harm inflicted upon these innocent, defenseless one-year-old toddlers was entirely preventable.

25. As a direct and proximate result of the acts and omissions of Camden Hill, J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B., and C.K. suffered serious and traumatic injuries—physical, emotional, psychological, and mental—that have irrevocably altered their lives and the lives of their families forever.

## PARTIES

26. Plaintiffs Jamus Hernandez and Alezandra Hernandez are the biological parents of Plaintiff J.H., a minor, and are citizens and residents of Collin County, Texas.

27. Plaintiffs Caleb Brian and Lianfei Brian are the biological parents of Plaintiff E.B., a minor, and are citizens and residents of Denton County, Texas.

28. Plaintiffs Emory Showalter and Hannah Showalter are the biological parents of Plaintiff O.S., a minor, and are citizens and residents of Denton County, Texas.

29. Plaintiffs Sage Baker and Amanda Tabor are the biological parents of Plaintiff R.B., a minor, and are citizens and residents of Tarrant County, Texas.

30. Plaintiffs James Kirk and Mackenzi Kirk are the biological parents of Plaintiff C.K., a minor, and are citizens and residents of Denton County, Texas.

31. Defendant Camden Hill, LLC d/b/a Camden Hill Montessori (herein referred to as "Defendant" or "Camden Hill") is a corporation doing business in the State of Texas, its state of formation. Defendant operated a daycare located at 2020 E Hebron Parkway, Suite 130, Carrollton, Texas, 75007, under Texas Child Care Operation License Number 1595944. Defendant may be served with process by serving its owner and registered agent Regina Crone, at 1071 Harpole Road E, Argyle, Texas, 76226 or wherever they may be found. Service of process is requested.

32. Defendant Melissa Rodriguez, an individual citizen and resident of Dallas County, Texas. Defendant Melissa Rodriguez may be served with process at 3525 Country Square Dr., Apt. M102, Carrollton, Texas 75006, in Dallas County, or wherever else she may be found. Service of process is requested.

## **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

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

34. Venue is proper in Dallas County, Texas, under Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code Section 15.002(a) because this is the county of a Defendant's residence at the time the cause of action accrued.

## **DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN & CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

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

36. 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.

## **CAUSES OF ACTION**

### **Count One – Negligence Against Defendant Camden Hill**

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

38. 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 Defendant. Defendant was 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 Plaintiffs J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B., and C.K.;
- 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 employees trusted with the care of minor Plaintiffs J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B., and C.K.;
- l. Failing to use positive methods of discipline and guidance with the children in its care;
- m. Failing to ensure caregiver employees demonstrate competency, good judgment, and self-control; and
- n. Failing to adhere to the Texas Minimum Standards for Childcare.

39. Defendant had a duty to exercise ordinary care in caring for, supervising, and disciplining the children in its care so as to prevent injury to Plaintiffs J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B., C.K., and other children similarly situated.

40. Defendant had a duty to maintain a safe environment for children in its care so as to prevent injury to Plaintiffs J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B., C.K., and other children similarly situated.

41. Defendant 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 Plaintiffs J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B., C.K., and other children similarly situated.

42. Defendant 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.

43. Defendant's 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 Against Defendant Camden Hill**

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

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

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

47. Defendant's violation of the statutes was the proximate cause of the incident in question.

48. As a result of the Defendant's acts and/or omissions in violating the statutes, Plaintiffs sustained damages.

**Count Three – Negligent Activity Against Defendant Camden Hill**

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

50. Defendant is the owner, operator, and/or possessor of the daycare premises located at 2020 E Hebron Parkway, Suite 130, Carrollton, Texas 75007, operation license number 1595944.

51. At the time of the incidents, J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B., and C.K. were minor children placed in the care of Defendant and was thus an "invitees" to whom Defendant owed a duty to exercise ordinary care.

52. Plaintiffs' injuries were the direct and contemporaneous result of Defendant's ongoing negligent activity on the premises at the time of the injuries and damages sustained.

53. Defendant owed Plaintiffs a legal duty to ensure the children's safety in maintaining proper care over J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B., and C.K.; reporting incidents that place children at risk of injury or harm; ensuring discipline over the children is appropriate; ensuring safe diaper changing procedures procedures are utilized; ensuring staff respond to injuries appropriately; ensuring staff interact with children in a positive manner; and ensuring that employees are necessarily hired, trained, supervised, and terminated in order to maintain a safe environment for children. Defendant breached these duties by permitting its employee-caregivers to repeatedly discipline children in an inappropriate manner and falsify incident reports to explain away bruises caused by the carelessness and lack of disregard for the innocent one-year-old toddlers suffering at the hands of Camden Hills' "very best."

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

#### **Count Four – Negligence Against Defendant Melissa Rodriguez**

55. Plaintiffs' negligence claim is based on the facts set out in this Petition.

56. Defendant Melissa Rodriguez was acting in the course and scope of her employment with Defendant Camden Hill at all times material to this lawsuit. The occurrences made the basis of this lawsuit and reflected in the above paragraphs, and the resulting injuries and damages to

Plaintiffs was proximately caused by the negligent conduct of Defendant Rodriguez. Defendant Rodriguez owed Plaintiffs a duty of ordinary care. Defendant Rodriguez was negligent by breaching the duty owed to Plaintiffs to exercise ordinary care in one or more of the following acts or omissions, constituting negligence:

- a. Failing to do what a reasonable caregiver would do in regard to interacting, supervising, caring for, and disciplining children placed in her care.
- b. Failing to provide a safe environment for the children placed in her care, including J.H., E.B., O.S., R.B., and C.K.
- c. Failing to comply with local and state laws and regulations pertaining to the care, interaction, supervision, and discipline of children.
- d. Failing to adhere to the Texas Minimum Standards for Childcare.
- e. Failing to use only positive methods of discipline and interaction with children by choosing to use prohibited punishment methods.

57. The standard of care violations of Defendant Rodriguez by her own acts and omissions, has directly and proximately caused injuries to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs seek damages for Defendant Rodriguez's negligence.

**Count Five – Gross Negligence Against Defendants Camden Hill and Melissa Rodriguez**

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

59. 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).

60. 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. The above acts and/or omissions were

singularly and cumulatively the proximate cause of the occurrences in question and the resulting injuries and damages sustained by Plaintiffs.

### **RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR**

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

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

### **DAMAGES**

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

64. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's negligent acts and/or omissions, Plaintiffs have 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;

- I. 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.

65. 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**

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

67. 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. 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**

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

## **U.S. LIFE TABLES**

69. 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: January 30, 2026.

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 K. 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 efilng system. The filer served this document via email generated by the efilng 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: 110668205  
Filing Code Description: Original Petition  
Filing Description:  
Status as of 2/2/2026 2:43 PM CST

### Case Contacts

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Ashley Washington		ashley@buttonlawfirm.com	1/30/2026 1:35:22 PM	SENT
Russell Button		service@buttonlawfirm.com	1/30/2026 1:35:22 PM	SENT
Russell Button		russell@buttonlawfirm.com	1/30/2026 1:35:22 PM	SENT