



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 7, 2019

Ms. Tiffany N. Leal
Chief Civil Prosecutor
Comal County District Attorney's Office
150 North Seguin Avenue, Suite 307
New Braunfels, Texas 78130-5161

OR2019-12169

Dear Ms. Leal:

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# 763989 (File No. 19OR-027).

The Comal County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for a specified incident report including body-worn camera recordings and any agreement between the sheriff's office and a specified entity. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note you have not submitted any information responsive to the request for an agreement between the sheriff's office and the specified entity. To the extent any information responsive to this portion of the request existed on the date the sheriff's office received the request, we assume the sheriff's office has released it. If the sheriff's office has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a),

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

.302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note 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.² 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

²As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your 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 demonstrate 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, an attorney for a potential opposing party making a demand for payment and asserting an intent to sue if such payments are not made. Open Records Decision Nos. 555 at 3 (1990), 346 (1982). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. See Open Records Decision No. 288 at 2 (1981). However, an individual publicly threatening to bring suit against a governmental body, but who does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, is not concrete evidence that litigation is reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 331 at 1-2 (1982).

You assert the remaining information is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code because the sheriff's office reasonably anticipates litigation relating to the named police officer's involvement in an off-duty incident. In support of your assertion, you have submitted a copy of a letter from the requestor stating a lawsuit will be brought against the named sheriff's deputy in his individual capacity and the company that hired him. Upon review, however, we find the sheriff's office has not demonstrated anyone had taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation against the sheriff's office or made any claim for damages or any specific threat to sue the sheriff's office when it received the request for information. Consequently, we find you have failed to demonstrate the sheriff's office reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the present request for information. As such, we conclude the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”³ 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. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). We note the requestor has a right of access to her client’s date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person’s agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, with the exception of the requestor’s client’s date of birth, the sheriff’s office must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth 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). We note section 552.130 protects privacy interests. Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to her client’s motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from her under section 552.130. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. However, the sheriff’s office must withhold all remaining driver’s license numbers and the state of registration under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, 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. With the exception of the information pertaining to the requestor’s client, the sheriff’s office must withhold (1) all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and (2) all driver’s license numbers and the state of registration under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The sheriff’s office 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.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 cursive script that reads "Emily Kunst".

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/jxd

Ref: ID# 763989

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)