



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 22, 2019

Ms. Sherri Russell
City Attorney
City of Lake Jackson
5B Oak Drive
Lake Jackson, Texas 77566-5289

OR2019-10615

Dear Ms. Russell:

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# 760670 (PIR# W003690-012319).

The City of Lake Jackson (the "city") received a request for body worn camera and dashboard camera recordings pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes peace 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) of the Occupations Code 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 provide the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the body worn camera recordings at issue were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.¹ However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by [s]ubsection (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 obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code; which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is exempted from public disclosure. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). In this instance, the city received the request for information on January 23, 2019. Thus, as you acknowledge, the city’s ten-business-day deadline was February 6, 2019. We note the envelope in which the city originally submitted the information required by section 552.301(b) was returned to the city for insufficient postage, and the city again submitted the required information to this office. The envelope in which the city provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was postmarked February 13, 2019. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code.

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, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302). The need of a governmental body, other than the governmental body that failed to timely seek an open records decision, to withhold information under section 552.108 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness. *See Open Records Decision No. 586* (1991). The city provided a statement from the Brazoria County District Attorney’s Office (the “district attorney’s office”) objecting to the release of the requested information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Therefore, we will consider whether the city may withhold the requested information under section 552.108 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office.

¹As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The city states, and provides documentation showing, the district attorney’s office objects to the disclosure of the information at issue because it relates to an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution with the district attorney’s office. Based upon these representations, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue, and the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office.

In summary, as the body worn camera recordings at issue were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. The city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office.

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,



James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/eb

Ref: ID# 760670

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)