

**Before the Presiding Judges of the Administrative Judicial Regions**  
**Per Curiam Rule 12 Decision**

**APPEAL NO.:** 24-004

**RESPONDENT:** Harris County Justice Courts Office of Court Management

**DATE:** April 3, 2024

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE:** Judge Stephen Ables, Chair; Judge Ray Wheless; Judge Dib Waldrip; Judge David Evans; Judge Missy Medary

Petitioner submitted a Public Information Act request for video footage from the Harris County Justice of the Peace, Precinct One, Place One “showing the courtroom where the judge’s desk area can be seen for hearings.” Respondent denied Petitioner’s request on Rule 12.5(b) (*Security Plans*) and Rule 12.5(i) (*Information Confidential Under Other Law*) exemption grounds. Respondent informed Petitioner that because the justice courts were not courts of record and because the Harris County Justice Courts had a local rule prohibiting the recording of proceedings in the courtroom, “any video recording device that would capture the courtroom would be used only for security purposes.” For the Rule 12.5(i) exemption, Respondent pointed to Texas Government Code Section 418.182 (*Confidentiality Of Certain Information Relating To Security Systems*), which makes confidential information in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. “Any camera that would view footage in the courtroom where’s [sic] the judge’s desk area could be seen,” Respondent wrote, “would be an integral part the overall courthouse security system used to protect the courthouse from criminal activities, and any recording from that camera would provide information deemed confidential by state law relating to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of the security system.” Petitioner then timely filed an appeal. Respondent did not reply to the petition.

In its denial letter, Respondent informed Petitioner that the video cameras in the courtroom were for security purposes only. Respondent also referenced Rule 12 Decision Number 21-015, which examined a request for recordings from a courthouse security camera. Like the respondent in Rule 12 Decision Number 21-015, the Respondent here asserts that the requested information is exempt from disclosure under Rule 12.5(i) because it is confidential under Government Code Section 418.182. And as we did in Rule 12 Decision Number 21-015, we agree with Respondent that the recordings are confidential under Section 418.182 because they contain information relating to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of the courthouse security system. Accordingly, the video footage is exempt from disclosure under Rule 12.5(i). Because the records are exempt under Rule 12.5(i), we need not consider Respondent’s Rule 12.5(b) exemption claim.

For the reasons stated above, the petition is denied.