

# Before the Presiding Judges of the Administrative Judicial Regions

## Per Curiam Rule 12 Decision

**APPEAL NO.:** 25-025

**RESPONDENT:** 63rd District Court, Val Verde County

**DATE:** December 30, 2025

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE:** Judge David Evans, Chair; Judge Ana Estevez; Judge Robert Trapp; Judge Sid Harle; Judge Ben Woodward

Petitioner requested from Respondent “copies of any written findings, orders, or correspondence confirming the disposition or closure of the investigation into the Kinney County Auditor conducted by” Respondent. Specifically, Petitioner stated, it sought records reflecting “[t]hat the investigation has been concluded” and “final findings, orders, or written determinations made by the court in relation to the matter.” In reply, Respondent stated that the requested records were exempt from disclosure under Rule 12.5(k) (*Investigations of Character or Conduct*). In its petition for review, Petitioner contended that a “document confirming closure or a final order constitutes an administrative or judicial record reflecting an official action” and that “[s]uch confirmation does not reveal . . . [information] protected under Rule 12.5(k).” Respondent did not provide a response to the petition.

Rule 12.5(k) exempts from disclosure “*Any record relating to an investigation of any person’s character or conduct* unless: (1) the record is requested by the person being investigated; and (2) release of the record, in the judgment of the records custodian, would not impair the investigation” (emphasis added). Because the records in question relate to Respondent’s investigation of the Kinney County Auditor, not the Petitioner, Rule 12.5(k) applies and the requested records are exempt from disclosure. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.