



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 3, 2019

Ms. Clarissa M. Rodriguez  
Counsel for the City of Uvalde  
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, P.C.  
2517 North Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2019-24453

Dear Ms. Rodriguez:

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# 783691 (City PIA Nos. 19-158, 19-159, 19-160, 19-183, and 19-198).

The City of Uvalde (the "city"), which you represent, received five requests from the same requestor for information related to a specified incident, including documents and audio and video recordings related to the investigation of the incident, and video recordings of the location of the incident on specified dates before and after the incident. You claim the submitted body worn camera recordings were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the submitted information includes 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:

- (a) the date and approximate time of the recording;
- (b) the specific location where the recording occurred; and

(c) 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. 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 note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

...

(5) all working papers, research material, and information used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds or taxes by a governmental body, on completion of the estimate[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3), (5). The submitted information contains records of the receipt and expenditure of public funds by the city that are subject to section 552.022(a)(3), as well as information used to estimate the expenditure of public funds by the city that is subject to section 552.022(a)(5). Such records must be released unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3), (5). You seek to withhold this information under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.108 are discretionary exceptions and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions); 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, because sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code make information confidential under the Act, we will consider their applicability to the information at issue. Further, we will consider your arguments against disclosure for the remaining information.

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 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 section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (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. *See 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). *See* ORD 551.

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." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. 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 litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state prior to the dates it received the instant requests for information, the city received a notice of claim from the requestor, an attorney whose clients' child was involved in an accident. You represent to this office the notice of claim meets the requirements of the TTCA. You further state the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Based on these representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to litigation that was reasonably anticipated on the dates the city received the requests for information for purposes of section 552.103.

We note, however, the opposing party has seen or had access to some of the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 of the Government Code is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to the litigation to obtain such information through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information seen by the opposing party, which we marked for release, under section 552.103. However, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may generally withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3 (1982).

However, we note information normally found on the front page of an offense or incident report is generally considered public. *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); *see* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). This office has stated basic information about a crime may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code, even if it is related to litigation. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). Thus, we find the basic offense information may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; *see also* ORD 127. Therefore, with the exception of basic information and the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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, 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

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note that basic information may generally not be withheld from public disclosure under 552.108 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991); Gov't Code § 552.108(c).

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. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information to be highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest; thus, it may not be withheld 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 recordings at issue 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 and basic information, the city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>2</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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Deborah Southerland  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

DS/be

Ref: ID# 783691

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party's representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles).