

Texas Comptroller Glenn Hegar Refuses to Pay Attorney General Ken Paxton His Back Pay



By: Amil Imani

December 9, 2023

We are talking about fairness and consistency in the treatment of elected officials. The question we should be asking is – Should an elected official face additional barriers in claiming rightful compensation, and is there room for a more compassionate approach in the face of legal intricacies?

“After being [acquitted](#) on impeachment charges, [Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton](#) now says he wants back pay for the suspended period while awaiting trial. Paxton’s office claims Comptroller Glenn Hegar infringed state law and the Texas Constitution by unlawfully withholding Paxton’s income.”

In this labyrinth, a troubling narrative unfolds – one that questions fairness and consistency. The crux revolves around whether an elected official should face additional barriers in claiming rightful compensation and if a more compassionate approach is warranted in the face of legal complexities. Yet, it appears that Comptroller Glenn Hegar, Texas, remains unyielding in his stance. And pray, what is his premise?

The question is, why is he playing hardball? Many speculations are flying around as to why Hagar is denying Paxton’s salary.

In [a letter obtained by The Texas Tribune](#), Paxton's office charges that the comptroller violated state law and the Texas Constitution "by refusing to issue salary payments to a duly elected statewide officeholder."

Some have suggested Hegar illegally took it away to help the House. He is aware that Paxton will sue him in Austin. Austin courts are all Democrats who would not side with Paxton. Glenn Hegar knows that and wants Paxton to sue him. Paxton most likely has to spend thousands of dollars on attorney's fees, perhaps more than the money they owe him. It appears Hegar conspired with the House and has an ulterior motive.

Hegar's actions might also be politically motivated, possibly in collaboration with the Texas House. Indeed, this is a significant angle – Hegar's own political aspirations may play a role in this unfolding drama. His actions could be part of a broader political strategy. We are left speculating on what political dynamics or alliances could influence Hegar's decision.

The crux of Hegar's argument lies in two state laws supposedly guiding his decision. [These laws](#), modified by the Legislature, allow certain state employees to enjoy paid leave under specific circumstances. However, Hegar explicitly states that these laws do not apply to state officeholders, which is false. In this case, the selective application of laws raises eyebrows, prompting us to ponder whether justice is truly blind to elected officials or whether Hager has personal issues with Paxton.

Moreover, the comptroller's office contends that back pay for a suspended state employee hinges on a pre-existing agreement – a notion that, without prior clarity, retroactive payment might be construed as an employment benefit. This begs the question: Should an elected official be subject to a different set of rules regarding compensation, and is a nuanced approach being overlooked?

[Paxton's office contends](#) it violates the Texas Constitution. Drawing on the precedent of allowing agency heads to grant leave without pay deduction, Paxton's team asserts that this principle should be extended to Paxton during his suspension, which seems reasonable.

However, Glenn Hegar, curiously enough, stands by the decision to halt Paxton's \$153,750 annual salary. Hegar's legal counsel recommends seeking a "definitive ruling" from the Texas Supreme Court, implying that the law is so clear-cut that only the highest legal authority can provide unequivocal guidance – raising the question, is the law truly that unambiguous?

The case of Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton stands out as a mystery – an innocent public servant wrongly suspended from duty and denied his financial salary. On the other hand, Hegar attempts to paint a picture of fidelity to an unambiguous law bolstered by a call for a "definitive ruling" from the highest legal authority.

One cannot help but wonder: Is there room for a nuanced perspective that upholds the principles of justice without compromising the integrity of the law? Does justice honestly wear a blindfold, or do the subtle nuances of legal interpretation sway it?

As the Texas Supreme Court looms on the horizon, the potential for a definitive ruling beckons. Will it unravel the complexities or further entangle us in the intricate legal intricacies? Only time will reveal the twists and turns in this unfolding saga, leaving us to ponder the elusive nature of justice in legal complexities.

© 2023 Amil Imani – All Rights Reserved