

# Before the Presiding Judges of the Administrative Judicial Regions

## Per Curiam Rule 12 Decision

**APPEAL NO.:** 25-015

**RESPONDENT:** 325th District Court, Tarrant County

**DATE:** August 11, 2025

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE:** Judge Missy Medary, Chair; Judge Dib Waldrip; Judge Ben Woodward; Judge Alfonso Charles; Judge Susan Brown

Petitioner requested from Respondent “a record of the audit logs documenting user access for [a certain case number].” Petitioner specifically sought “detailed logs identifying any deletions, alterations, modifications, or adjustments made to existing docket entries or filings beyond the initial recording of filing entrances.” Petitioner stated the request “explicitly includes: (1) User identifiers for those involved in accessing, deleting, altering, or modifying court records; (2) Dates and times of each deletion, alteration, or modification; [and] (3) Descriptions of each specific entry or filing affected by these actions and the people involved with authorization of these acts.” In its appeal, Petitioner complained that Respondent “neither acknowledged receipt of my request nor responded” to Petitioner's request. In a reply to the petition, Respondent informed Petitioner and the special committee that Respondent did not find records responsive to the request.

If a requested record does not exist, a Respondent’s inability to produce the requested record is not a denial of access to judicial records under Rule 12. See Rule 12 Dec. Nos. 17-015, 23-003, 23-010, 25-007. Moreover, Rule 12 provides procedures for responding to requests when judicial records are available, but it is silent regarding the duty or procedure to follow when a requested record does not exist. It is helpful to inform requestors that the records they seek do not exist, but Rule 12 does not require it. *See* Rule 12 Dec. Nos. 17-015, 22-004. Finally, Rule 12 does not require a court to create records responsive to a request. *See* Rule 12.4(a)(1).

Respondent has informed the special committee that it does not have any documents responsive to the request. There being no records responsive to Petitioner’s request, and consistent with our prior opinions, the appeal is dismissed.