

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 19-30519  
\_\_\_\_\_

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

February 7, 2020

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

In the Matter of: ORACLE OIL, L.L.C.,

Debtor.

ORACLE OIL, L.L.C.,

Appellant,

versus

EPI CONSULTANTS, A Division of Cudd Pressure Control, Incorporated,

Appellee.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Louisiana  
No. 2:18-CV-3674  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before JOLLY, SMITH, and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Plaintiff Oracle Oil, L.L.C., solely owned by Robert Brooks, operated an

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

No. 19-30519

oil well. As debtor in this bankruptcy proceeding, Oracle seeks damages from EPI Consultants for alleged breach of contract and negligence in connection with EPI's consulting services on the well. Oracle alleges that, because of EPI's actions, Oracle suffered expenses and loss of future profits from the well.

EPI avers that Oracle cannot establish that it is entitled to any damages. EPI contends that Brooks's other companies—not Oracle—paid all invoices for the well's expenses. But Oracle claims that Brooks, through oral contracts with himself acting on behalf of his companies, directed the payments on the understanding that Oracle would be obligated to reimburse the other companies. EPI points out that Louisiana law requires that, in addition to Brooks's testimony, Oracle must present "corroborating evidence" that the contract existed; Oracle has provided none.

EPI moved for summary judgment. Concluding that Oracle could not establish that it had sustained damages, the district court granted the motion. We have examined the briefs, the applicable law, and pertinent parts of the record and have heard the oral arguments of counsel. The district court properly granted summary judgment as explained primarily in its comprehensive Order and Reasons entered on June 6, 2019. The judgment is **AFFIRMED**, essentially for the reasons set forth in that order.