



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 22, 2017

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2017-29166

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 689818 (COSA File No. W187540).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident.¹ The city states it is withholding access device numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.² The city states it is releasing some of the requested information, including the police officer's crash report pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(c) (providing for release of accident report to person or entity listed under this subsection). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of

¹We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note and you acknowledge, a portion of the submitted information consists of an officer's body worn camera recording. 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;
- (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 recording at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.³ 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.* 1701.661(b).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, 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

³As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the argument against disclosure of this information.

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). The 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 that (1) litigation is 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure 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 establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.* In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing litigation is reasonably anticipated by representing it received a notice-of-claim letter that is in compliance with the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), chapter 101 of the Civil Practices and Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance.

You state the city received a notice-of-claim letter before receiving the instant request for information and the notice complies with the requirements of the TTCA. Thus, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. We also find you have established the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

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 section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code. Chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Sections 772.218 is applicable to an emergency 9-1-1 district established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). This section makes the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers

that are furnished by a service supplier confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 1.5 million. You indicate some of the information at issue consists of the originating telephone numbers of 9-1-1 callers. You inform us the city is part of an emergency communication district established under section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code. Thus, to the extent the telephone numbers of the 9-1-1 callers were supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code. However, if the information at issue was not supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier, then the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information you marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recording at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information, and the city need not release it in response to this request for information. The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the telephone numbers of the 9-1-1 callers were supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.

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, 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Michelle Case", with a stylized flourish at the end.

D. Michelle Case
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DMC/som

Ref: ID# 689818

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)