

# Before the Presiding Judges of the Administrative Judicial Regions

## Per Curiam Rule 12 Decision

**APPEAL NO.:** 15-007

**RESPONDENT:** Travis County Auditor (as agent for the judiciary)

**DATE:** July 6, 2015

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE:** Judge Stephen B. Ables, Chairman; Judge Mary Murphy; Judge Olen Underwood; Judge David Peebles; Judge Kelly G. Moore

Petitioner requested from Respondent any communication sent to Respondent requesting the review of court appointment vouchers. Respondent denied Petitioner's request claiming that the information was exempt from disclosure under Rule 12.5(a), Judicial Work Products and Drafts, and Rule 12.5(f), Internal Deliberations on Court or Judicial Administration Matters. Petitioner then filed this appeal.

In its response to this appeal, Respondent also claims that the requested information relates to the investigation of a person's character or conduct and may also be withheld under Rule 12.5(k). Rule 12.5(k) exempts from disclosure the following:

“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.”

Respondent has provided this committee with a copy of the responsive document for our *in camera* review. We agree that it relates to the investigation of a person's conduct and is exempt from disclosure under Rule 12.5(k).

Having found that the responsive document is exempt from disclosure under Rule 12.5(k), we need not address the other exemptions raised by Respondent. The appeal is denied.