

In The Court of Appeals Hifth District of Texas at Dallas

No. 05-11-01363-CV

STEVEN CREAR, SR., Appellant V. FORD MOTOR COMPANY, Appellee

On Appeal from the 162nd Judicial District Court Dallas County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. DC-09-13456-I

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Justices Moseley, Francis, and Lang Opinion by Justice Moseley

Steven Crear, Sr. appeals the trial court's final judgment granting Ford Motor Credit Company's (Ford Credit) combined traditional motion for summary judgment (on its own claims) and no-evidence motion for summary judgment (on Crear's counterclaims). In a single issue, Crear argues the trial court abused its discretion by ruling on the summary judgment motions six days after their submission without conducting a hearing or providing Crear sufficient time to oppose the motions. The background and facts of the case are well known to the parties; thus, we do not recite them here. Because all dispositive issues are settled in law, we issue this memorandum opinion. Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(a), 47.4. We affirm the trial court's judgment.

The trial court conducted a status hearing on July 26, 2011, and instructed the parties to

file any motions, responses, and replies by August 10, 2011. The trial court informed the parties

that it would rule on the motions during the week of August 15, 2011. Neither party objected to

the court's timetable. On August 10, 2011, Ford Credit filed its combined traditional and no-

evidence motion for summary judgment, and Crear filed his motion for summary judgment. On

August 16, 2011, the trial court granted Ford Credit's summary judgment motions and denied

Crear's summary judgment motion.

"To preserve a complaint for appellate review, a party generally must present it to the

trial court by timely request, motion, or objection, stating the specific grounds, and obtain a

ruling." Tate v. Andrews, 372 S.W.3d 751, 754 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2012, no pet.); TEX. R. APP.

P. 33.1(a). The record does not show that Crear presented a timely objection to the trial court

concerning the lack of a hearing on Ford Credit's motions for summary judgment or the

timetable provided for filing a response to Ford Credit's motions. See Tate, 372 S.W.3d at 754;

TEX. R. APP. P. 33.1(a).

Because Crear failed to preserve his complaint for appellate review, we affirm the trial

court's judgment.

/Jim Moseley/

JIM MOSELEY

JUSTICE

111363F.P05

2



Court of Appeals Fifth District of Texas at Dallas

JUDGMENT

STEVEN CREAR SR., Appellant On Appeal from the 162nd Judicial District

Court, Dallas County, Texas

No. 05-11-01363-CV V. Trial Court Cause No. DC-09-13456-I.

Opinion delivered by Justice Moseley.

Justices Francis and Lang participating.

FORD MOTOR CREDIT COMPANY, Appellee

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, the judgment of the trial court is **AFFIRMED**.

It is **ORDERED** that appellee FORD MOTOR CREDIT COMPANY recover its costs of this appeal from appellant STEVEN CREAR SR.

Judgment entered this 4th day of April, 2013.

/Jim Moseley/

JIM MOSELEY JUSTICE