



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 26, 2019

Mr. T. Daniel Santee  
Counsel for the City of Bandera  
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, P.C.  
2517 North Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2019-05381

Dear Mr. Santee:

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# 752107.

The City of Bandera (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for seven categories of information pertaining to a named individual. You claim the submitted body worn camera recording were not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code. You also claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you note, and we agree, the submitted information includes police 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;

- (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 pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. 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).

Next, we must address the city’s procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general’s decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(a), (b). In this instance, you state, and submit documentation demonstrating, the city received the request for information on November 29, 2018. Accordingly, the city’s ten-business-day deadline was December 13, 2018. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until December 14, 2018. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The city claims sections 552.107 and 552.108 of the Government Code for the remaining information. Because section 552.107 can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your argument under this section for the submitted information. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining exception.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or

documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state the remaining information consists of communications between attorneys for the city, city employees and officials, and a privileged party that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You indicate the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based upon your representations and our review, we find most of the remaining information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1). However, upon review, we find the information we marked for release has been shared with an individual you have not demonstrated is a privileged party. Therefore, we conclude you have failed to establish how the information we marked constitutes communications between privileged parties for the purposes of section 552.107. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information we marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Thus, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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,



Emily Kunst  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EK/som

Ref: ID# 752107

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)