

**Dianne Hensley,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**State Commission on Judicial Conduct, et  
al.,**

Defendants.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS

459th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

### ORDER

On December 4, 2025, the Court heard Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. As indicated at the hearing, Defendants subsequently filed a Motion to Withdraw Admissions on December 8, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the parties filed a Rule 11 Agreement Regarding Admissibility of Summary Judgment Evidence and a Joint Motion to Permit Consideration of Summary Judgment Briefing and Evidence. On December 19, 2025, the Court signed an Agreed Order Granting Leave of Court Under Rule 166a(c) to permit consideration of Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and Exhibits 14-17 to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment. Having reviewed the above motions, the responses, the documents in the case file, and applicable authorities,<sup>1</sup> hereby ORDERS as follows:

- The Court, having found good cause and no undue prejudice, hereby GRANTS Defendants' Motion to Withdraw Admissions.
- The Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment with respect to Plaintiff's claims under the Texas Religious Freedom Restoration Act and finds as follows:


---

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes that applicable authorities include *Umphress v. Gary L. Steel*, No. 25-0288, 69 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 179, 2025 Tex. LEXIS 1198, at \*1-2 (Jan. 9, 2026), *Hensley v. State Comm'n on Judicial Conduct*, 692 S.W.3d 184 (Tex. 2024), and *Hensley v. State Comm'n on Judicial Conduct*, 717 S.W.3d 106 (Tex. App.—Austin 2025, no pet. h.).

- The Court finds that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact with respect to Plaintiff's claims under the Texas Religious Freedom Restoration Act.
- The Court finds that Plaintiff is entitled to judgment as a matter of law under the Texas Religious Freedom Restoration Act.
- The Court finds that (i) Plaintiff has shown that Defendants substantially burdened Plaintiff's free exercise of religion and (ii) Defendants have failed to show that the application of the burden to Plaintiff "is in furtherance of a compelling government interest" and "is the least restrictive means of furthering that interest".
- The Court finds that Plaintiff is entitled to compensatory damages in the amount of \$10,000.00, the maximum amount permitted under section 110.005(b) of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code, and that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact surrounding the amount of compensatory damages to which Plaintiff is entitled.
- The Court finds that Plaintiff is entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as reasonable attorney's fees, court costs, and other reasonable expenses incurred in bringing the action, as provided by section 110.005(a) of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code.
- The Court hereby DISMISSES for lack of jurisdiction (i) Plaintiff's claims brought under the Uniform Declaratory Judgment Act and (ii) Plaintiff's *ultra vires* claims.
- The Court hereby DENIES Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment.

Plaintiff shall submit an application for reasonable attorney's fees, court costs, and other reasonable expenses incurred in bringing the action no later than 21 days after the entry of this order.

Dated: February 19, 2026.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Judge Presiding