

Case No. 468-54065-2025

In the Matter of the Marriage of	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT
	§	
ANGELA SUZANNE PAXTON and	§	468th DISTRICT COURT
	§	
WARREN KENNETH PAXTON, JR.,	§	COLLIN COUNTY, TEXAS
	§	

**CAMPAIGN FOR ACCOUNTABILITY’S
PLEA IN INTERVENTION
AND MOTION TO UNSEAL COURT RECORDS**

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF THIS COURT:

Intervenor Campaign for Accountability (“CfA”), a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that promotes government transparency and accountability, files this Plea in Intervention and Motion to Unseal Court Records and would respectfully show:

I. Introduction and summary.

CfA intervenes for the limited purpose of moving to vacate the order sealing the court records in this case. Long-established constitutional and common law principles require Texas court proceedings to be open to the public. The right of public access may be overcome only after a substantial showing of particularized need and only when any sealing is narrowly tailored to address that showing. The Court’s order, which completely seals all judicial records in this case without making any finding of particularized need, violates that presumptive right of public access.

The public has a particular interest in this case, which involves two of Texas’s highest-ranking officials, Attorney General Ken Paxton and State Senator Angela Paxton, who together represent over 31 million Texans. In addition, Paxton has announced his intent to run against U.S. Senator John Cornyn in the 2026 Republican primary. AG Paxton has been accused in impeachment proceedings and a civil lawsuit of using his office to benefit his mistress and to conceal an extramarital affair. His financial dealings have also drawn extensive public scrutiny.

Senator Paxton, who played a pivotal and controversial role during her husband’s impeachment, has publicly identified adultery as the reason she filed for divorce; by contrast, AG Paxton blames “political attacks and public scrutiny,” not his own extramarital conduct.

Although Senator Paxton’s two-sentence motion to seal made no effort to overcome the heavy presumption of public access to court records, it was granted by the local administrative judge without a hearing after the District Judge recused herself. Because neither the motion nor order identified a proper legal basis for sealing the records, the order should be summarily vacated. And it should not be reinstated because the Paxtons cannot overcome the presumption of openness, given their senior positions in Texas government and the substantial publicity the couple’s conduct, both official and individual, has already received. Because the sealing order denies Texans crucial information about the conduct and character of two high-ranking elected officials – information the public is presumptively entitled to – the Court should vacate that order and unseal this case’s court records.

II. Factual background.

Ken and Angela Paxton have been prominent public figures for nearly three decades. In the 1990s, they helped found Stonebriar Community Church, a Christian evangelical church in Frisco, Texas. In 2002, Ken Paxton won a contested election to the Texas House by mobilizing the local Christian community in his support.¹ In 2012, voters elected him to the Texas Senate. Two years later, he was elected Texas Attorney General.

In 2017, Angela Paxton entered a contested Republican primary for the Texas Senate seat her husband previously held. She won the primary and narrowly won the 2018 general election.

¹ Morgan Smith, *Paxton Goes to Church, Extols Christian Voices in Politics*, TEX. TRIBUNE, Sep. 20, 2015, <https://www.texastribune.org/2015/09/20/paxton-addresses-grapevine-church/>.

She was re-elected in 2022 and again in 2024.

A. The Attorney General's affair and impeachment.

In 2018, the Paxtons convened a meeting of the Attorney General's top deputies, during which the Attorney General confessed to an extramarital affair.² After the meeting, aides reportedly believed that AG Paxton had ended the affair.³ But in 2019, he admitted to an aide that the affair was continuing and asked the aide to "be more accommodating" about his personal arrangements, including his security detail.⁴

In 2020, seven of AG Paxton's top deputies reported to the FBI that he had used his office to benefit a mistress and to conceal his ongoing extramarital affair. After being terminated, four of those deputies filed a whistleblower lawsuit, alleging that AG Paxton fired them in retaliation for their report. AG Paxton later asked the Texas Legislature to fund a \$3.3 million settlement in the whistleblower case with taxpayer money. Instead, the House conducted its own investigation, found the deputies' allegations credible, and impeached AG Paxton on twenty articles, including using his office to benefit a real estate developer who had given the Attorney General's mistress a job and paid for improvements to the Paxtons' home. The Texas Senate ultimately acquitted AG Paxton on a party-line vote⁵ after an impeachment trial that cost Texas taxpayers \$5.1 million.⁶

² Patrick Svitek, *Former chief of staff for AG's office details alarm over Ken Paxton's alleged affair*, TEX. TRIBUNE, Sep. 11, 2023, at <http://texastribune.org/2023/09/11/ken-paxton-affair-impeachment-trial/>

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Senator Paxton declined to recuse herself from the proceedings but was ultimately barred from voting on her husband's impeachment, although her participation raised the threshold needed to secure a conviction.

⁶ *A Special Audit of Expenses Related to the Impeachment Trial*, STATE AUDITOR OF TEXAS, March 19, 2025, at <https://sao.texas.gov/reports/main/25-021.pdf>.

The whistleblower lawsuit went to trial in April 2025, resulting in a \$6.6 million judgment for the plaintiffs that AG Paxton has declined to appeal, leaving Texas taxpayers on the hook for payment.⁷ Amidst these controversies over his public and private conduct, AG Paxton announced on April 8, 2025, that he would challenge incumbent John Cornyn for his U.S. Senate seat.

B. Senator Paxton's divorce petition.

On July 10, 2025, Senator Paxton filed for divorce in the 429th District Court for Collin County, Texas. Her petition alleges that AG Paxton has committed adultery and seeks a disproportionate share of the parties' estate.⁸ Before the divorce petition was reported publicly, Senator Paxton posted a message to her 17,000 followers on X announcing that she had filed for divorce on "biblical grounds," citing "recent discoveries."



⁷ Eleanor Klibanoff, *Paxton drops appeal: Texas to pay \$6.6 million to whistleblowers*, TEX. TRIBUNE, July 3, 2025, at <https://www.texastribune.org/2025/07/03/ken-paxton-attorney-general-whistleblowers-appeal/>.

⁸ The court filings are not included as exhibits due to the sealing order, but some were posted before the order was entered and are available online.

Senator Paxton’s public announcement raised questions about what constitutes “divorce on biblical grounds” and about AG Paxton’s conduct and character. Her post generated much public interest, garnering over 17.7 million views, 23,000 “likes,” and 5,000 comments.

AG Paxton then issued a statement to his 479,000 followers on X blaming the divorce filing on “political attacks” and “public scrutiny,” not his own conduct:



C. The sealing order.

Following the Paxtons’ public statements, Senator Paxton filed a unilateral Motion to Seal Court Records later the same day. Her two-sentence motion simply said that the court records were not subject to the sealing procedures of Rule 76a, Tex. R. Civ. P., and that sealing “will not have an adverse effect on the public health or safety, and the records do not involve matters that should be available to the general public.” District Judge Jill Renfro Willis voluntarily recused herself the same day without providing a reason.

An “Agreed Order on Motion to Seal Court Records” was entered on July 11, 2025, by Administrative Judge Ray Wheless, sealing all filings in this case, although the motion was filed unilaterally and not denominated “agreed.” As best can be gleaned from the public docket sheet, the case was transferred to another court on July 16, and another judge recused themselves that same day. Ex. 1. On July 17, the case was transferred twice, with both receiving judges also

recusing themselves, until July 21, when the case was apparently specially assigned to this Court by the Collin County Presiding Judge. *Id.* One interested member of the public has already tried to assert the public right of access to the court file by appealing the sealing order *pro se.* *Id.*

III. The sealing order should be vacated.

A. Intervenor CfA has standing to challenge the sealing order on its behalf and on behalf of the public.

CfA is a nonpartisan, nonprofit watchdog organization that seeks to hold the powerful accountable using research, litigation, and publications to expose misconduct and malfeasance in public life, including federal and state government, and large corporations.⁹ CfA regularly publishes reports on its investigations, and its leadership and members provide information and commentary to news media across the political spectrum.¹⁰ CfA therefore has standing to challenge the Court’s sealing order that precludes its and the public’s access to the documents filed in this case. *In re Dolcefino Comm’s, LLC*, – S.W.3d –, 2025 WL 2471307, at *4 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] Aug. 28, 2025, orig. proceeding); *In re Fort Worth Star Telegram*, 441 S.W3d 847, 850-51 (Tex. App. – Fort Worth 2014, orig. proceeding).

B. Although its sealing procedures do not apply to Family Code cases, Rule 76a does not provide courts *authority* to seal court records.

Senator Paxton’s motion correctly noted that Rule 76a, Tex. R. Civ. P., excludes documents filed in divorce cases from its definition of “court records.” *See* Tex. R. Civ. P. 76a(2)(a)(3). While Rule 76a imposes additional procedural requirements for sealing court documents to which it applies, the rule does *not* remove the presumption of openness for other cases, nor does it provide legal *authority* to seal such cases. In fact, the rule prohibits sealing court orders and opinions in

⁹ *See* <https://campaignforaccountability.org>.

¹⁰ *See* <https://campaignforaccountability.org/in-the-news>.

any case, including the sealing and recusal orders in this case. *See* Tex. R. Civ. P. 76a(1) (“[N]o court order or opinion issued in the adjudication of a case may be sealed.”); *In re Dolcefino Comm’s*, 2025 WL 2471307, at *6 n.8 (“Court orders and opinions are not included within rule 76a’s definition of ‘court records’ to which the sealing procedures apply.”). Moreover, the rule specifically provides that “[a]ccess to documents in court files not defined as court records by this rule remains governed by existing law.” Tex. R. Civ. P. 76a(9). That “existing law” is the common law, governing court rules, and constitutional provisions guaranteeing public access to court proceedings and files except in the most unusual and narrow circumstances. *E.g., Interest of B.H.*, No. 14-22-00068-CV, 2023 WL 5236040, at *3 (Tex. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] Aug. 15, 2023, no pet.) (the “common law of sealing” applies to cases not covered by Rule 76a).

C. The sealing order should be vacated.

The public’s general right to access judicial proceedings “is a fundamental element of the rule of law, is recognized under the common law, constitutionally guaranteed, and incorporated into our procedural rules.” *Baker v. Bizzle*, 687 S.W.3d 285, 294 (Tex. 2024). As the U.S. Supreme Court recognized long ago, it “is clear that the courts of this country recognize a general right to inspect and copy judicial records and documents.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 597–98 (1978). “Judicial records are public records. And public records, by definition, presume public access.” *Binh Hoa Le v. Exeter Fin. Corp.*, 990 F.3d 410, 416 (5th Cir. 2021). Under this long-established right of access, before sealing any document, a court must weigh “the public’s common law right of access against the interests favoring nondisclosure.” *Le*, 990 F.3d at 419 (internal quotations omitted).

Here, the two-sentence motion to seal and the immediately entered sealing order failed to engage in the analysis required by law. *Bihn Hoa Le*, 990 F.3d at 420. The order contains no

“document-by-document inquiry,” “no grappling with public and private interests,” “no consideration of less drastic alternatives,” and “no assurance that the extent of sealing [is] congruent to the need.” *Id.* at 419-20. There are “no reasons given” and “no authorities cited” for the “perpetual and wholesale” secrecy the order invokes. *Id.* at 420. In short, the order accepts Senator Paxton’s unsupported, conclusory assertions at face value rather than being “ungenerous with [its] discretion to seal judicial records.” *Id.* at 418. For this reason alone, the sealing order should be vacated.

D. The Paxtons cannot overcome the presumption of court openness.

Even if Senator Paxton had tried to establish an evidentiary and legal basis for sealing this case, she would have failed. This proceeding involves no minor children. Although there are allegations of infidelity and a request for a disproportionate division of the marital estate that may involve the Paxtons’ financial records, neither ground would justify overcoming the presumption that court records are available to the public, let alone outweigh the particular public interests at stake in this litigation.

1. The public has a significant interest in this case.

The public has an overriding interest in the personal and professional conduct of its elected officials. *King v. Paxton*, 576 S.W.3d 881, 902 (Tex. App. – Austin 2019, pet. denied) (“[I]nformation regarding the behavior of public officials, including elected officeholders and police officers, is often considered newsworthy due to the officials’ status as ‘public servants’ in the community”). AG Paxton and Senator Paxton are both high-ranking elected officials whose conduct and character are important to Texas voters. *Garrison v. Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 64, 77 (1964) (recognizing “the paramount public interest in a free flow of information to the people concerning public officials, their servants” and finding “anything which might touch on an

official's fitness for office is relevant"); *Plante v. Gonzalez*, 575 F.2d 1119, 1135 (5th Cir. 1978) ("Plaintiffs in this case are not ordinary citizens, but state senators, people who have chosen to run for office... [which] put[s] some limits on the privacy they may reasonably expect").

The public interest is heightened here. The Paxtons have made their Christian faith a cornerstone of their political identities. AG Paxton credited the Christian community for his election to office in 2002 and he repeatedly invokes his Christian faith in public and private appearances,¹¹ most recently to warn school districts to follow a recently enacted law requiring them to post the Ten Commandments in their classrooms, despite a federal court holding the law unconstitutional, claiming he "will not back down from defending the virtues and values that built this country,"¹² presumably including the Commandments condemning adultery, false witness, and coveting. The Attorney General cannot credibly claim a divorce proceeding based on "biblical grounds" is a wholly private matter of no concern to his constituents and the public.

Further tying the personal and public together, AG Paxton has been credibly accused of using his office to further an adulterous relationship. Whether and how the State's top law enforcement officer is abusing his office to conduct extramarital affairs is a question of character and integrity, as well as the quality of public service and use of public resources. AG Paxton asked for \$3.3 million dollars in taxpayer money to settle the whistleblower lawsuit; his impeachment trial cost taxpayers \$5.1 million and kept the Legislature from conducting other business on behalf

¹¹ Morgan Smith, *Paxton Goes to Church, Extols Christian Voices in Politics*, TEX. TRIBUNE, Sep. 20, 2015, <https://www.texastribune.org/2015/09/20/paxton-addresses-grapevine-church/>.

¹² <https://texasattorneygeneral.gov/news/releases/attorney-general-ken-paxton-instructs-texas-schools-display-ten-commandments-accordance-texas-law>. He is specifically recommending that school children recite Christian prayers "as taught by Jesus Christ." <https://texasattorneygeneral.gov/news/releases/attorney-general-ken-paxton-encourages-texas-schools-begin-legal-process-putting-prayer-back>.

of Texans, now taxpayers must pay the \$6.6 million whistleblower judgment against him.

The Paxtons' finances are also matters of public concern. "Even in financial matters, public officials usually have less privacy than their private counterparts." *Plante*, 575 F.2d at 1136. Mortgage records reportedly show that the Paxtons have claimed homestead exemptions on three separate residences,¹³ which, if true, would violate Texas law. *See* Tex. Tax Code § 11.13(h) ("A person may not receive an exemption under this section for more than one residence homestead in the same year."). The Paxtons have reportedly rented out homes that, according to mortgage documents, were to be used as residences, not rentals. AG Paxton has reportedly failed to disclose some properties on his personal financial disclosure forms, as required by state law.¹⁴ This legal proceeding is likely to shed light on the ownership and use of those properties, and given the parties' status as elected officials – including AG Paxton as the State's top law enforcement official – the public deserves transparency regarding the couple's financial assets and interests. *See Plante*, 575 F.2d at 1136. Whether elected officials have abused their offices or violated state law would be of interest to voters at any time, but these questions are especially salient as AG Paxton mounts a campaign for the United States Senate.¹⁵ *Id.*

¹³ *Attorney General Ken Paxton claims three houses as primary residence, mortgage papers show*, Associated Press, July 24, 2025, <https://www.dallasnews.com/news/politics/2025/07/24/attorney-general-ken-paxton-claims-three-houses-as-primary-residence-mortgage-papers-show/>.

¹⁴ Simone Carter, *Ken Paxton's Apparent Luxury Rental Home Is an Urban Cowboy's Wet Dream*, DALLAS OBSERVER, Dec. 8, 2023, <https://www.dallasobserver.com/news/inside-ken-paxtons-apparent-oklahoma-vrbo-vacation-rental-home-18064925>.

¹⁵ Attorney General Paxton's opponent in the Republican primary, incumbent Senator John Cornyn, has already made clear that he plans to make Ken Paxton's alleged misconduct a central issue in the race, billing the contest as a "a test of whether character still matters." J. David Goodman, *Cornyn Calls Primary Fight Against Ken Paxton a 'Test of Character'*, N.Y. TIMES, May 30, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/30/us/cornyn-paxton-texas-primary.html>.

2. The Paxtons cannot show a compelling interest in sealing this case.

The Paxtons have not shown – and cannot show – any interest in sealing this case that outweighs the significant public interest in disclosure. Senator Paxton’s sealing motion offered only the conclusory assertion, unsupported by evidence or law, that “the records do not involve matters that should be available to the general public.” Even assuming the motion had claimed privacy interests in the allegations of adultery and financial matters, neither would support a sealing order in this case.

i. Personal embarrassment does not justify sealing court records.

Senator Paxton cannot request sealing based on her accusation of adultery because both AG Paxton’s previous affair and Senator Paxton’s recent accusation of continuing infidelity are public information. *E.g., Davenport v. Garcia*, 834 S.W.2d 4 (Tex. 1992) (vacating gag order prohibiting parties and counsel from discussing court proceedings). Senator Paxton’s accusation of continuing adultery as the basis for her divorce filing, although potentially embarrassing, was made public by her. But even if that information was not already public, judicial records may not be sealed simply because they contain information or accusations that are “unpleasant, embarrassing, and distasteful” to the parties. *See Sealed Appellant*, 2024 WL 980494, at *2.

In *Sealed Appellant*, for instance, Fifth Circuit recognized that the common law right of access extends to “unpleasant, embarrassing, and distasteful information” about an extramarital affair and divorce. 2024 WL 980494, at *2. There, like here, an intervenor moved to unseal a case file that had been sealed at the request of a party who claimed it contained personal information. The district court granted the intervenor’s motion to unseal, and the Fifth Circuit affirmed, noting that “[m]any cases of a sensitive nature are typically open to the public.” *Id.* at *2. The case’s details – involving claims of “revenge porn” – were likely much more embarrassing

than adultery, yet the court held that case “should not be sealed on a wholesale basis” and any redactions should be limited to information such as “Social Security numbers, financial account numbers, birth dates, and names of minor children.” *Id.* The same presumption of openness applies with even greater force here where the parties are not private citizens, but high-ranking elected officials.

ii. Texas law rejects a privacy interest in extramarital affairs.

AG Paxton cannot request sealing on the grounds that this case involves his extramarital affair because the Texas Supreme Court has explicitly rejected any privacy interest in adultery, holding that an extramarital affair “is unlike the recognized privacy rights concerning child rearing, family relationships, procreation, marriage, contraception, and abortion.” *City of Sherman v. Henry*, 928 S.W.2d 464, 469-70 (Tex. 1996). In *City of Sherman*, the Court rejected a police officer’s claim that his extramarital affair fell within a right to privacy guaranteed by the constitution. *Id.* The Court wrote that while the “constitution’s framers may have been willing to die for the right of free expression, there is no indication they were willing to make any sacrifice for the right to commit adultery.” *Id.* As Justice Cornyn wrote for the Court, “adulterous conduct is the very antithesis of marriage and family.” *Id.* If a rank-and-file Texas police officer has no legal right to conceal his extramarital affair, neither does a Texas Attorney General and candidate for the U.S. Senate.

E. Courts across the country routinely unseal divorce records of elected officials.

Courts nationwide have regularly unsealed divorce proceedings in cases involving elected officials, citing the public interest in such information and the lack of compelling reasons for nondisclosure. *See, e.g., George W. Prescott Pub. Co. v. Register of Prob. for Norfolk Cnty.*, 479 N.E.2d 658, 662 (Mass. 1985) (unsealing divorce records of county treasurer on grounds that “a

public official has a significantly diminished privacy interest with respect to information relevant to the conduct of his office”); *Ellison v. Ellison*, No. 27-FA-11-74751, 2018 Minn. Dist. LEXIS 4 (Minn. Dist. Ct. Oct. 12, 2018); *Gallego v. Washington Free Beacon*, No. 1 CA-CV 24-0527, 2024 WL 4459307, at *1 (Ariz. Ct. App. Oct. 10, 2024). This public interest is especially prominent when both parties are elected officials.

In *Ellison v. Ellison*, for instance, a Minnesota district court found that the common law required unsealing a divorce proceeding between the state’s Attorney General and his ex-wife, who was also an elected school board member. 2018 Minn. Dist. LEXIS 4. The court rejected the argument that the parties’ elected offices conferred any special privacy interest and “speculative” concerns that disclosure would endanger the security of either party. *Id.* at *9 (noting that “a short query in any search engine or a review of any local newspaper will likely reveal [the Attorney General’s] location at a number of dates and times in the future”). The court also rejected the Ellisons’ argument that the details of their divorce could be used for an “improper purpose,” finding that argument was “less persuasive [for elected officials] than for other litigants” because, like the Paxtons, they are “subject to public scrutiny and comment.” *Id.* at *10. The district court’s order was upheld on appeal. *Id.*

Similarly, in *Gallego v. Washington Free Beacon*, an Arizona district court unsealed the divorce proceedings of Democratic U.S. House Representative Ruben Gallego and Phoenix Mayor Kate Gallego after a conservative news outlet intervened to unseal the case. 2024 WL 4459307, at *1. That ruling came at a time when Rep. Gallego, like AG Paxton, was seeking election to the U.S. Senate, and the case was unsealed even though, unlike here, the Gallegos’ divorce involved their minor children. The ruling was upheld on appeal. *Id.*

While these out-of-state cases are not binding, they reflect the well-reasoned opinions of

other courts applying the same legal principles that apply here. Texas voters deserve no less than their counterparts in Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Arizona; they too are entitled to transparency about their public officials and candidates for elective office.

IV. Conclusion and prayer.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Intervenor prays that this matter be set for hearing as soon as practicable; that its Motion to Unseal Court Records be in all things granted; that the past and future court records in this case be and remain unsealed; and that Intervenor be given all such other and further relief, at law or in equity, to which it may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Peter D. Kennedy

Peter D. Kennedy
State Bar No. 11296650
Matthew Harding
State Bar No. 24066944
Graves, Dougherty, Hearon & Moody, P.C.
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2700
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 480-5764 (Phone)
(512) 536-9908 (Fax)
pkennedy@gdhm.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENOR
CAMPAIGN FOR ACCOUNTABILITY**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served upon all counsel of record via electronic service on September 3, 2025.

/s/ Peter D. Kennedy

Peter D. Kennedy

<https://research.txcourts.gov/CourtRecordsSearch/ViewCasePrint/2a51a913346d4997896155640c88e751>

Case Information

In the Matter of the Marriage of Angela Suzanne Paxton and Warren Kenneth Paxton, Jr.

468-54065-2025

Location

Collin County - 468th District Clerk

Case Category

Family

Case Type

Divorce No Children

Case Filed Date

7/10/2025

Judge

Wynne, Lindsey

Case Status

Closed (Appealed)

Parties ²

Type	Name	Nickname/Alias	Attorneys
Petitioner	Angela Suzanne Paxton		Charla Bradshaw
Respondent	Warren Kenneth Paxton, Jr		Jared W Julian, Laura B Roach

Events ²⁵

Date	Event	Type	Comments	Documents
7/10/2025	Filing	OPDIVC	Original Petition for Divorce	
7/10/2025	Filing	MOTF	Motion Seal Court Records	
7/10/2025	Filing	ANSR	Respondent's Original Answer	
7/10/2025	Filing	NOTA	Notice of Appearance of Co-Counsel	
7/10/2025	Filing	ORDREC	Order of Recusal	
7/11/2025	Filing	ORDRDC	Agreed Order on Motion to Seal Court Records	
7/16/2025	Filing	CTRF	Order Transferring	
7/16/2025	Filing	NAPP	Notice of Appeal by Member of the Public	
7/16/2025	Filing	ORDREC	Order of Recusal	
7/17/2025	Filing	CTRF	Order Transferring	
7/17/2025	Filing	ORDREC	Order to Recuse	
7/17/2025	Filing	CTRF	Order Transferring	
7/17/2025	Filing	ORDREC	Order of Recusal	
7/21/2025	Filing	ORDRDC	Order of Assignment by the Presiding Judge	
7/22/2025	Filing	NOT	Notice of Change in Case Information	
7/29/2025	Filing	CTCORR	fax/e-mail received by the court	
8/4/2025	Filing	NAPP	05-25-00981-CV - Amended Notice of Appeal by Member of the Public Post-Transfer	
8/4/2025	Filing	ACCOA		
8/4/2025	Filing	ACCOA	Sent Request for Letter of Designation to Appellant	

Exhibit 1 - Page 2 of 2

Date	Event	Type	Comments	Documents
8/4/2025	Filing	LOD	Request for Items to Include in the Clerks Record on Appeal by Member of the Public	
8/8/2025	Filing	CORR	Request for Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law by Member of the Public	
8/14/2025	Filing	ACL		
8/14/2025	Filing	AO		
8/20/2025	Filing	RESPDC	Petitioner's and Respondent's Joint Response in Opposition to Request for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	