

781 Fed.Appx. 368 (Mem)

This case was not selected for publication in West's Federal Reporter.

See Fed. Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1 generally governing citation of judicial decisions issued on or after Jan. 1, 2007. See also U.S.Ct. of App. 5th Cir. Rules 28.7 and 47.5.

United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit.

Jason Lee VAN DYKE, Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Thomas Christopher RETZLAFF, also known as
Dean Anderson, doing business as BV Files,
ViaView Files, L.L.C., and ViaView Files,
Defendant - Appellant

No. 18-40710

|

Summary Calendar

|

FILED October 22, 2019

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Eastern District of Texas, USDC No. 4:18-CV-247

Attorneys and Law Firms

Jason Lee Van Dyke, Crossroads, TX, for
Plaintiff-Appellee

Jeffrey Lee Dorrell, Hanszen Laporte, L.L.P., Houston,
TX, for Defendant-Appellant

Thomas S. Leatherbury, Esq., Vinson & Elkins, L.L.P.,
Dallas, TX, Bruce D. Brown, Reporters Committee for
Freedom of the Press, Washington, DC, Margaret Dunlay
Terwey, Francis Ming Yang, Vinson & Elkins, L.L.P.,
San Francisco, CA, for Amici Curiae Reporters
Committee for Freedom of the Press, 39 Media
Organizations

Before WIENER, HAYNES, and COSTA, Circuit Judges.

Opinion

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff Jason Lee Van Dyke sued Defendant Thomas Retzlaff, alleging various causes of action based upon allegedly false and harassing statements Retzlaff made about Van Dyke in state court; Retzlaff removed the case to federal court on diversity jurisdiction grounds. The district court opinion ably explains the facts of the case but, suffice it to say, Retzlaff moved to dismiss the claims based upon the Texas Citizens Participation Act (TCPA)¹,

which is an “anti-SLAPP”² statute. The district court denied the motion to dismiss, concluding that the relevant portions of the TCPA did not apply in federal court. Retzlaff filed an interlocutory appeal to our court.

We first examine whether we have jurisdiction of this interlocutory appeal. The parties agree that the collateral order doctrine applies to this appeal. Based upon precedent, we agree that we have jurisdiction to address whether the Texas anti-SLAPP statute applies here. *Diamond Consortium, Inc. v. Hammervold*, 733 F. App'x 151, 154 (5th Cir. 2018) (per curiam); *NCDR, L.L.C. v. Mauze & Bagby, P.L.L.C.*, 745 F.3d 742, 747–48 (5th Cir. 2014). That jurisdiction is limited; we cannot address the underlying merits of the case outside the anti-SLAPP question. See *Mauze & Bagby*, 745 F.3d at 747 (“[T]he collateral order doctrine can confer *limited* appellate jurisdiction.” (emphasis added)).

The next question, then, is whether the district court correctly denied the motion to dismiss based upon the TCPA. At the time that the district court ruled, the application of the Texas anti-SLAPP statute in a federal court exercising diversity jurisdiction was an open question in our circuit. However, by the time the appeal was ripe for decision, we had decided the issue. See *Klocke v. Watson*, 936 F.3d 240, 242 (5th Cir. 2019). We determined that “the TCPA *369 does not apply to diversity cases in federal court.” *Id.*

After allowing the parties to submit supplemental briefing on this point, we conclude that *Klocke* is dispositive. In his supplemental brief, Retzlaff tries to distinguish the two cases by pointing out lapses in the defendant's briefing in *Klocke* that are different from Retzlaff's robust briefing. But the core of *Klocke* does not rest on such lapses, so we are bound by the rule of orderliness to follow its holding. See *Jacobs v. Nat'l Drug Intelligence Ctr.*, 548 F.3d 375, 378 (5th Cir. 2008). Retzlaff's other procedural arguments are beyond the scope of this interlocutory appeal. We express no opinion on the ultimate merits of the case; nor do we opine on the validity of a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment based on arguments other than the TCPA.

AFFIRMED; the case is REMANDED for further proceedings in the district court.

All Citations

781 Fed.Appx. 368 (Mem)

Footnotes

- * Pursuant to 5th Cir. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5th Cir. R. 47.5.4.
- 1 [TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE ANN. § 27.001.](#)
- 2 “SLAPP” is short for Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation.

End of Document

© 2019 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.