



**COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
FIRST DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT HOUSTON**

ORDER

Appellate case name: Great Value Storage, LLC and World Class Capital Group, LLC v. Princeton Capital Corporation

Appellate case number: 01-21-00284-CV

Trial court case number: 2019-18855

Trial court: 165th District Court of Harris County

This appeal is a consolidation of two notices of appeal, docketed together as required by the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 12.2(c) (“Multiple Notices of Appeal. All notices of appeal filed in the same case must be given the same docket number.”). As to the first notice of appeal, Great Value Storage LLC (“Great Value”) and World Class Capital Group LLC (“WCCG”) challenge the final judgment in favor of Princeton Capital Corporation (“Princeton Capital”) on its breach of contract claim. As to the second notice of appeal, Great Value and WCCG challenge the order appointing a receiver.

This Court previously abated this appeal on the parties’ representation that they had reached a settlement agreement. We further ordered the parties to file quarterly updates to inform this Court whether the settlement had been finalized and the receivership wound down.

The receiver has informed this Court that the parties have settled on the amount owed under the trial court’s judgment. In a letter to the trial court dated March 13, 2023, the receiver stated that the March 4, 2021 judgment in favor of Princeton Capital has been fully paid, and proceeds have been distributed to Princeton Capital’s public shareholders.

“A case becomes moot if, since the time of filing, there has ceased to exist a justiciable controversy between the parties—that is, if the issues presented are no longer ‘live,’ or if the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome.” *Heckman v. Williamson Cty.*, 369 S.W.3d 137, 162 (Tex. 2012). When a party appeals an order appointing a receiver or authorizing sale of certain property and the property has been sold, the appeal of the order becomes moot.” *Mitchell v. Turbine Res. Unlimited, Inc.*, 523 S.W.3d 189, 196 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2017, pet. denied).

The receiver’s representation that the parties have settled and that proceeds have been distributed to Princeton Capital’s public shareholders suggests that the appeal is moot as to both the final judgment and the order appointing a receiver.

Accordingly, we **order the appeal reinstated.**

The Court intends to dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. The **parties are ordered to file a response** to this order indicating why this Court should not dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 42.3(a). **The parties' responses must be filed no later than ten (10) days from the date of this order.**

It is so ORDERED.

Judge's signature: /s/ Peter Kelly
 Acting individually Acting for the Court

Panel consists of Justices Kelly, Countiss, and Rivas-Molloy.

Date: March 30, 2023