## **Before the Presiding Judges of the Administrative Judicial Regions**

## **Per Curiam Rule 12 Decision**

**APPEAL NO.:** 16-002

**RESPONDENT:** Administrative Office of the District Courts – Harris County

**DATE:** March 17, 2016

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE:** Judge Stephen B. Ables, Chairman; Judge Mary Murphy; Judge

Billy Ray Stubblefield; Judge Missy Medary; Judge Dean Rucker

Petitioner requested from Respondent "any documentation or information about the process, method, and reasons behind designating the 164<sup>th</sup> Civil Court as the Anti-gang injunction court, to deal with gang injunction civil lawsuits." Respondent denied Petitioner's request claiming that the information was exempt from disclosure under Rule 12.5(f). Petitioner then filed this appeal. In its response, Respondent also claims that the information is exempt under Rule 12.5(b).

The two exemptions raised by Respondent, Rule 12.5(b) and (f), read as follows:

- (b) *Security Plans*. Any record, including a security plan or code, the release of which would jeopardize the security of an individual against physical injury or jeopardize information or property against theft, tampering, improper use, illegal disclosure, trespass, unauthorized access, or physical injury.
- (f) Internal Deliberation on Court of Judicial Administration Matters. Any record relating to internal deliberations of a court or judicial agency, or among judicial officers or members of a judicial agency, on matters of court or judicial administration.

Respondent has provided this committee with a copy of the responsive documents for our *in camera* review. We agree that the records submitted for our review are exempt from disclosure under Rule 12.5(f) and that portions are exempt under Rule 12.5(b).

Accordingly, we sustain the denial of access to the requested records.