KENT S. RICHARDSON
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

(512) 922-6124
KENT.RICHARDSON@OAG.TEXAS.GOV

Criminal Prosecutions Division
OFFICE: (512) 463-3038
FAX: (512) 397-1642

April 17, 2026

Kyle Moring

Re: PIA Complaint Against Titus County District Attorney

The Texas Office of the Attorney General (OAG) is in receipt of a complaint filed by you against the Titus County District Attorney (TCDA) for alleged violation(s) of the Public Information Act (PIA). As required by Government Code Section 552.3215, this office must determine whether the alleged violation(s) were committed, determine whether action will be brought under the PIA, and notify the complainant in writing of our determinations. In addition, should this office elect not to bring an action pursuant to Section 552.3215 of the PIA, we are required to provide a statement giving you the basis for such a determination and return the complaint.

Background

Based on the information you provided, it appears that the following timeline outlines the relevant events concerning your request:

11/17/25	Complaint made to TCDA under §552.3215 concerning requests for information made to the City of Mount Pleasant.
2/27/26	Request for information made to the Titus County DA (TCDA).
3/17/26	TCDA produces information responsive to the request.
4/1/26	TCDA produces additional information responsive to the request.
4/16/26	TCDA issues preliminary determination on the complaint made concerning the City of Mount Pleasant.

Analysis

You complain that the TCDA did not timely respond to your request for information, did not timely provide the requested information, did not issue a cost estimate, nor did it timely seek a ruling from the Open Records Division (ORD) on the request. If a governmental body is unable to produce public information within 10 days, it must

certify that fact and schedule a date within a reasonable time when the information will be available. §552.221(d). Based on the information provided, it appears that the TCDA did not provide this certification, and an apparent violation is found.[1] You have recently supplemented your complaint to include the failure by the TCDA to respond to your complaint against the City of Mount Pleasant. The PIA requires complaints to first be made to the district or county attorney where the governmental entity is located. §552.3215(e). Once a complaint is made, the district or county attorney is required to either make a determination on the complaint or indicate that a conflict exists and notify that the complaint can be made to the attorney general. §552.3215(g) and §552.3215(h). It appears that the TCDA did not make a determination or notify of a conflict within 30 days after the complaint was made. Therefore, an apparent violation is found for this complaint.[2]

You have also recently supplemented your complaint regarding the TCDA's alleged failure to address a criminal complaint made to that office. Any failure by the TCDA to review or otherwise act on a criminal complaint is not a violation of the PIA and thus cannot be addressed in the complaint process found in §552.3215. Therefore, no violation is found on this complaint.

The OAG has limited civil enforcement jurisdiction to address violations of the PIA. That jurisdiction is provided in sections §552.321 and §552.3215. These provisions allow for the OAG to seek judicial compliance with the PIA in civil court to compel the release of public information (§552.321 – mandamus; §552.3215 – declaratory judgment and injunctive relief). These remedies serve to provide the OAG with a means of ensuring that requestors are provided public information when appropriate under the PIA and that other ministerial duties imposed by the PIA are observed. Because it appears that the TCDA has cured the apparent violations found, no action will be taken on this complaint.

This determination is subject to revision upon receipt of new, relevant, and persuasive information.

Respectfully,

/s/Kent S. Richardson
Deputy Division Chief
Criminal Prosecutions Division

enc. Complaint

[1] As noted, the TCDA did release responsive information four days after the 10-day period had elapsed. The TCDA later supplemented the release with emails between yourself and the TCDA as they were specifically requested as well. The TCDA has confirmed that it has now cumulatively released all responsive information.
[2] As noted, the TCDA has since cured the violation by issuing its preliminary determination.