

**CAUSE NO. 25-18363**

**VICTOR HOLLENDER, BRUCE §      IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF  
NEITZKE, ESTHER SCHNEIDER, and §  
SARAH RIVAS, §  
Plaintiffs, §  
v. §      GILLESPIE COUNTY, TEXAS  
§  
ROGERS DRAW ENERGY STORAGE, §  
LLC, and B&CWR, INC., d/b/a §  
CACTUS CONSTRUCTION, §  
Defendants. §      216TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**GILLESPIE COUNTY'S ANSWER TO  
ROGERS DRAW ENERGY STORAGE, LLC'S COUNTERCLAIMS**

**TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:**

COMES NOW, Gillespie County, Texas (“County” or “Intervenor”), and files this Answer to the Counterclaims asserted by Defendant Rogers Draw Energy Storage, LLC (“Rogers Draw”) in its Plea to the Jurisdiction, General Denial and Affirmative Defenses, Counterclaims, and Request for Injunctive Relief. In support thereof, the County respectfully shows the Court as follows:

**1.**

**RESPONSE TO PLEA TO THE JURISDICTION**

Rogers Draw’s Plea to the Jurisdiction should be denied. The County's claims present a justiciable controversy that is ripe for adjudication.

**A. The County's Claims Are Ripe.** Rogers Draw fundamentally mischaracterizes the nature of the County’s intervention. The County does not seek “preemptive judicial intervention based on hypothetical future regulatory noncompliance.” Rather, the County seeks to prevent imminent, concrete, and particularized harm to public safety arising from

the construction and proposed operation of a 145-megawatt lithium-ion battery energy storage facility less than 1,700 feet from Harper Independent School District, where approximately 600 schoolchildren attend classes daily.

The ripeness doctrine ensures that courts do not render advisory opinions on abstract or hypothetical disputes. *Patterson v. Planned Parenthood*, 971 S.W.2d 439, 442 (Tex. 1998). A claim is ripe when the facts have developed sufficiently, such that “an injury has occurred or *is likely to occur.*” *Id.* (emphasis added). Here, the facts are not hypothetical:

- Rogers Draw has commenced construction of the BESS facility;
- The facility’s location is fixed at less than 1,700 feet from Harper ISD;
- Harper lacks municipal water supply for fire suppression;
- Gillespie County’s volunteer fire departments lack specialized training, equipment, and water resources to address lithium-ion battery thermal runaway events; and
- Evacuation of the school and surrounding community during a thermal runaway event would be mathematically impossible given known road capacities and response times.

These are present, verifiable infrastructure conditions that create significant threats to public health and safety in light of the proposed construction of the Rogers Draw facility—not speculative fears. The County need not wait for children to be harmed before seeking judicial protection. *See City of Waco v. Tex. Nat. Res. Conservation Comm’n*, 83 S.W.3d 169, 175 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, pet. denied) (claims are ripe when the plaintiff demonstrates a “realistic threat” of imminent harm). Fundamentally, a plaintiff need not

“show that the injury has already occurred, provided the injury is imminent or *sufficiently likely*.” *Id.* (emphasis added). The injury at issue is the threat to public safety; in light of the County’s infrastructure and emergency response limitations, and the commencement of construction at the Rogers Draw site, this threatened injury is “sufficiently likely” for the County’s claims to be ripe. *Id.*

**B. The County Has Standing to Assert Its Claims.** Gillespie County intervenes not as a private property owner but as a political subdivision with constitutional and statutory duties to protect public health, safety, and welfare. *See Tex. Const. art. XI, § 5;* *see generally Tex. Local Gov’t Code Ch. 232, 240, 343, 352.* Texas counties possess authority to act to prevent public harm before an actual injury occurs, so long as the threat of injury is reasonably certain. *Halco Tex., Inc. v. McMullen County*, 221 S.W.3d 50, 76 (Tex. 2006) (noting that “nuisances can be prohibited” and that the use of property “may be restricted by the government in the legitimate exercise of its police power”); *Freedman v. Briarcroft Prop. Owners, Inc.*, 776 S.W.2d 212, 216 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989, writ denied) (noting that a nuisance cause of action can seek to “prevent a threatened injury where an act or structure will be a nuisance *per se*, or will be a nuisance for which there is no adequate remedy at law, or where a nuisance is imminent”).

As stated above, the specific infrastructure and emergency response considerations in the County, in conjunction with the selection of the Rogers Draw site and its proximity to the Harper ISD campus, render the threatened injury reasonably certain. The County’s intervention asserts governmental interests distinct from those of the private plaintiffs. The County bears responsibility for emergency response coordination, fire protection services, public road maintenance, and protection of critical water resources within unincorporated

areas. These sovereign governmental interests are directly implicated by the proposed BESS facility and confer standing independent of any private property claims. Therefore, the County has standing to bring this cause of action.

2.

### **GENERAL DENIAL**

Subject to the defenses and affirmative matters set forth herein, the County enters a general denial to all claims, allegations, and requests for relief asserted by Rogers Draw in its Counterclaims. Tex. R. Civ. P. 92.

3.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Without waiving its general denial and without assuming any burden of proof that would otherwise rest upon Rogers Draw, the County asserts the following affirmative defenses:

**A. Governmental Immunity.** Gillespie County is a political subdivision of the State of Texas and retains governmental immunity from suit and liability except where expressly waived by the Legislature. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ch. 101; *Reata Constr. Corp. v. City of Dallas*, 197 S.W.3d 371, 374 (Tex. 2006). Rogers Draw's Counterclaims do not fall within any statutory waiver of immunity. Accordingly, the County is immune from Rogers Draw's claims for declaratory and injunctive relief to the extent such claims seek to impose liability or compel governmental action.

**B. No Private Right of Action.** To the extent Rogers Draw's Counterclaims attempt to assert claims arising under statutes or regulations that do not create a private right of action enforceable against the County, such claims are barred.

**C. Exercise of Police Power.** The County's intervention in this action constitutes a lawful exercise of its police power to protect public health, safety, and welfare. Such governmental action does not give rise to counterclaims for declaratory or injunctive relief.

*See City of College Station v. Turtle Rock Corp.*, 680 S.W.2d 802, 804 (Tex. 1984).

**D. No Justiciable Controversy for Declaratory Relief.** To the extent Rogers Draw seeks declaratory relief, the Uniform Declaratory Judgments Act requires a justiciable controversy between the parties. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 37.004. Declaratory relief is not available to obtain an advisory opinion or to determine questions not yet arising from an existing state of facts. *Bonham State Bank v. Beadle*, 907 S.W.2d 465, 467 (Tex. 1995). Rogers Draw's requests for declarations regarding "hypothetical future regulatory noncompliance" or the abstract validity of the County's claims are not justiciable.

**E. Unclean Hands.** Rogers Draw's Counterclaims seeking equitable relief are barred by the doctrine of unclean hands. Rogers Draw has commenced construction of a large-scale industrial facility in close proximity to a public school and residential community without adequate provision for emergency response, fire suppression, or community safety.

4.

#### **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

The County opposes Rogers Draw's request for injunctive relief against the Intervenor. Rogers Draw cannot establish the elements required for injunctive relief:

**A. No Probable Right to Relief.** Rogers Draw cannot demonstrate a probable right to the relief sought against the County because the County's intervention represents a

lawful exercise of governmental authority to protect public safety. There is no legal basis for enjoining a political subdivision from participating in judicial proceedings to protect the health, safety, and welfare of its residents.

**B. No Irreparable Injury.** Rogers Draw cannot establish that it will suffer irreparable injury absent an injunction. Any harm to Rogers Draw from the County's participation in this litigation is speculative and, in any event, compensable through ordinary legal remedies. In contrast, the harm to public safety that the County seeks to prevent—potential death or serious injury to schoolchildren, residents, resources, and public and private property from a lithium-ion battery fire—is truly irreparable.

**C. Balance of Equities.** The balance of equities weighs decisively against injunctive relief. Rogers Draw's commercial interest in proceeding with construction cannot outweigh the safety of approximately 600 schoolchildren, their teachers, and the surrounding community. The potential for catastrophic harm from a thermal runaway event at the proposed site—documented extensively in the County's Petition in Intervention—substantially outweighs any burden imposed on Rogers Draw by the County's participation in this litigation.

5.

**PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Intervenor Gillespie County, Texas respectfully prays that:

- A. The Court deny Rogers Draw Energy Storage, LLC's Plea to the Jurisdiction;
- B. The Court deny Rogers Draw's Counterclaims in their entirety;
- C. The Court deny Rogers Draw's request for injunctive relief against the County;

- D. The Court award the County its costs of court; and
- E. The Court grant such other and further relief to which the County may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ William M. McKamie*

---

William M. McKamie, Lead Counsel  
State Bar No. 13686800  
Email: [mmckamie@toase.com](mailto:mmckamie@toase.com)

Rachel Raggio  
State Bar No. 24126598  
Email: [rraggio@toase.com](mailto:rraggio@toase.com)

Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla & Elam, LLP  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107  
Phone: 817-332-2580  
Fax: 817-332-4740

Sara Neel  
Gillespie County Attorney  
State Bar No. 24077622  
125 West Main, Suite L41  
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624  
Telephone: (830) 990-0675  
Facsimile: (830) 992-2615  
[sneel@gillespiecounty.gov](mailto:sneel@gillespiecounty.gov)

**ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENOR  
GILLESPIE COUNTY, TEXAS**

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

A true and correct copy of the above and foregoing instrument has been served on the following counsel of record through the electronic filing manager in accordance with Rule 21a(a)(1) or (2) the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure on this 12th day of January, 2026.

**Plaintiffs' Attorneys:**

Ross Sutherland  
[rsutherland@scottdoug.com](mailto:rsutherland@scottdoug.com)  
Anthony Arguijo  
[aarguijo@scottdoug.com](mailto:aarguijo@scottdoug.com)  
Shelby Hart-Armstrong  
[sharmstrong@scottdoug.com](mailto:sharmstrong@scottdoug.com)  
**SCOTT DOUGLASS & MCCONNICO LLP**  
303 Colorado Street, Suite 2400  
Austin, Texas 78701

C. Dixon Mosty  
Email: [cdmosty@mostylaw.com](mailto:cdmosty@mostylaw.com)  
Richard C. Mosty  
Email: [rmosty@mostylaw.com](mailto:rmosty@mostylaw.com)  
**MOSTY LAW FIRM**  
222 Sidney Baker St., Ste. 400  
Kerrville, Texas 78028

**Defendant Rogers Draw Energy Storage LLC Attorneys:**

Jeremiah Anderson  
[jjanderson@mcguirewoods.com](mailto:jjanderson@mcguirewoods.com)  
Jason Huebinger  
[jhuebinger@mcguirewoods.com](mailto:jhuebinger@mcguirewoods.com)  
**McGuire Woods LLP**  
845 Texas Ave, 24<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, TX 77002

*/s/ William M. McKamie*

---

William M. McKamie

## 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.

Rebecca Meek on behalf of William McKamie

Bar No. 13686800

rmeek@toase.com

Envelope ID: 109955518

Filing Code Description: Answer/Response

Filing Description: Gillespie County's Answer to Rogers Draw Energy Storage, LLC's Counterclaims

Status as of 1/13/2026 1:03 PM CST

### Case Contacts

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Gregory A.Scrivener		greg.scrivener@fordmurray.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Jeremiah Anderson	24040432	jjanderson@mcguirewoods.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Richard Mosty	14594800	rmosty@mostylaw.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Alfred Huebinger	24065460	jhuebinger@mcguirewoods.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Charles Mosty	24041532	cdmosty@mostylaw.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
William H.Ford		bill.ford@fordmurray.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Ross Sutherland		rsutherland@scottdoug.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Michelle Joyner		mjoyner@scottdoug.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Kennedy HatfieldAsel		hatfieldasel@fordmurray.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Rachel Raggio		rraggio@toase.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Jennifer R.Cook		jrcook@mcguirewoods.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Jennifer Juneau		jjuneau@scottdoug.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Anthony Arguijo		aarguijo@scottdoug.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
William M.McKamie		mmckamie@toase.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Rebecca Meek		rmeek@toase.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Shelby Hart-Armstrong		sharmstrong@scottdoug.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Jessi Abramson		jabramson@scottdoug.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Carla Matheson		cmatheson@scottdoug.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Sara Neel		sneel@gillespiecounty.gov	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Sam Causey		scausey@mostylaw.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Michael Suchosky		michael.suchosky@fordmurray.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT
Nikki Sims		nsims@mcguirewoods.com	1/12/2026 4:36:39 PM	SENT