



DEFENDING LIBERTY • PROTECTING PRINCIPLES • STANDING FOR TRUTH

5900 Balcones Drive, Suite # 20675 • Austin, TX 78731 • Tel.: (512) 720-6218 •

www.remnantlawfirm.com

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

June 17, 2026

Media Contact:

Remnant Law

Phone: (512) 720-6218

Email: info@remnantlawfirm.com

**Remnant Law Urges Texas Supreme Court to Enforce Public-Records Ruling
Against Nueces County District Attorney**

*With the Texas Attorney General Backing Disclosure, Petition Alleges the District Attorney Sealed
Public Grand-Juror Records Two Days Before an Appellate Mandate to Avoid Compliance*

AUSTIN, TX — **Remnant Law** has filed its reply brief in the Supreme Court of Texas, urging the Court to enforce a final appellate judgment requiring the release of grand-juror names under the Texas Public Information Act (PIA). The matter, *In re Julie Shodrok*, No. 26-0373 (Tex.), names the presiding judge of the 105th Judicial District Court of Nueces County as respondent and Nueces County District Attorney James D. Granberry as real party in interest. Remnant Law has requested oral argument.

In 2020 and 2021, public-records requestor Julie Shodrok sought the names of grand jurors connected to matters involving public officials in Port Aransas. The Texas Attorney General issued three opinions concluding that grand-juror names are public information and ordering their disclosure. The District Attorney sued the Attorney General to block release. In January 2024, the Third Court of Appeals rejected that effort, holding that the names are not exempt under the PIA and must be disclosed. *Attorney General of Texas v. Gonzalez*, 683 S.W.3d 861 (Tex. App.—Austin 2024, pet. denied). The Supreme Court of Texas denied review, and the appellate mandate issued on February 5, 2025.

Jonathan Hullihan of Remnant Law has confronted the Nueces County District Attorney’s Office before. Hullihan, President and General Counsel of Remnant Law, filed the removal action against then-District Attorney Mark Gonzalez — the official whose office first withheld these records — on behalf of Nueces County resident Colby Wiltse and in partnership with the grassroots watchdog group Citizens Defending Freedom. Gonzalez resigned ahead of the removal trial in 2023.

According to the petition, two days before that mandate issued, the District Attorney obtained an order from the 105th District Court returning the records to the court and sealing them as “personnel information” under Rule of Judicial Administration 12.5(c). The petition alleges the District Attorney’s own motion acknowledged that the mandate was “scheduled to issue” and sought to place the records beyond his office’s ability to comply with the ordered disclosure.

When Ms. Shodrok sought mandamus in the Third Court of Appeals, **the Texas Attorney General intervened in support of disclosure**, arguing that the sealing order defied the PIA and the finality of the appellate judgment and emphasizing the Legislature’s policy of open government. The Third Court nonetheless denied relief without opinion on March 4, 2026, leaving the Supreme Court of Texas as the remaining forum.

In its reply, Remnant Law argues that the District Attorney’s response is an impermissible collateral attack on a final judgment that relitigates issues the Third Court already decided. The reply points to the District Attorney’s own letter to the Attorney General, which it alleges conceded that the sealing order placed the records “*beyond the power or ability of this office to comply*” with the required disclosure. The reply further notes that a 2025 amendment to the Government Code (S.B. 311, effective September 1, 2025) confirms the Court’s authority to direct the District Attorney, and that an order entered to defeat a superior court’s mandate is void.

“A final appellate judgment is not a suggestion. The Attorney General agrees these records are public, every level of review has said so, yet they remain sealed. No official may evade a binding ruling by shuffling public records to another court for sealing — if that tactic works, the Public Information Act means nothing,” said Jonathan K. Hullihan, President and General Counsel of Remnant Law.

The petition asks the Supreme Court to vacate the February 3, 2025 sealing order, compel release of the grand-juror names in compliance with the appellate mandate, hold that governmental bodies may not evade the PIA or an appellate judgment by transferring records to the judiciary, and award attorneys’ fees and costs under Tex. Gov’t Code § 552.323.

“I followed every step the law provides and won at every level, yet the records are still sealed. The public has a right to this information, and I will keep fighting until it is released,” said Ms. Shodrok.

On May 8, 2026, the Supreme Court of Texas ordered the District Attorney to respond to the petition rather than denying it outright — a step the Court does not take in most original mandamus proceedings and, Remnant Law notes, a signal that the case is receiving serious consideration. With the District Attorney’s response and Relator’s reply now filed, briefing is complete and the matter awaits the Court’s decision.

Disclaimer: *This release is based on allegations contained in the publicly filed petition and reply. The statements herein are not findings of fact by any court, and the allegations remain subject to the litigation process.*

About Remnant Law

Remnant Law is a non-profit public interest law firm representing parents, pastors, and citizens in matters of constitutional liberty, parental rights, and First Amendment freedoms. Remnant Law represents clients across Texas and throughout the United States in federal and state courts on matters for the benefit of the general public.

###