



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 1, 2016

Ms. Linda Hight  
Records Coordinator  
City of Cleburne  
P.O. Box 677  
Cleburne, Texas 76033

OR2016-04859

Dear Ms. Hight:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 600142.

The Cleburne Police Department (the "department") received a request for eight categories of information related to a specified police report. You claim the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You note some of the submitted information consists of officers' body worn camera recordings. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you do not raise section 552.130 in your brief, we understand you to raise this exception based on your markings in the documents.

(2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and

(3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.<sup>2</sup> However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.*

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov’t Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate

---

<sup>2</sup>As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

This office has also concluded a governmental body's receipt of a claim letter that it represents to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance, is sufficient to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996). If that representation is not made, the receipt of a claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *Id.*

You state the City of Cleburne (the "city") received a notice of claim letter from an attorney representing an individual allegedly injured in the accident that is the subject of the requested information. You have submitted the notice of claim letter for our review. The notice of claim letter purports to comply with the notice requirements of the TTCA. However, we note the submitted notice of claim letter was not received by the city until after the department received the instant request for information, and, thus, does not demonstrate the city anticipated litigation on the date the request for information was received. In addition, while the request for information shows the requestor is an attorney who was retained by an individual involved in the incident at issue prior to date of the request, as stated above, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. ORD 361. You have not provided this office with evidence anyone had taken any objective steps toward filing a lawsuit prior to the date the department received the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e); ORD 331. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate the department or the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the department received the instant request for information. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of

private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>3</sup> *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3. Thus, the department must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a). However, we note the requestor has a right of access to his client's motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a) ("person or a person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Thus, the department may not withhold the requestor's client's motor vehicle record information from him under section 552.130. However, we determine the department must withhold the remaining motor vehicle record information you marked, as well as the motor vehicle record information we have indicated in the submitted pictures and video recordings that does not pertain to the requestor's client, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, pursuant to section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code the body worn camera recordings need not be released. The department must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the information we have marked for release that pertains to the requestor's client, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

information you marked and we indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.<sup>4</sup>

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Matthew Taylor  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MT/bhf

Ref: ID# 600142

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup>We note the requestor in this instance has a right of access to some of the information being released that would otherwise be excepted from release under the Act. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.023(b); *see also* ORD 481 at 4.