



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 8, 2019

Mr. Laurence E. Boyd
Counsel for the City of Oyster Creek
P.O. Box 269
Angleton, Texas 77516-0269

OR2019-31702

Dear Mr. Boyd:

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# 796144

The Oyster Creek Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received two requests for all information related to a specified incident involving the requestor's clients. The department states it released some information. The department states it will withhold information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, 552.117, and 552.1175 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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:

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

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 at issue 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 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).

² As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

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. If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* ORD 638 at 4.

The department informs us, and provides documentation demonstrating, simultaneously with the department’s receipt of the instant requests for information, the requestor submitted a Letter of Representation and Demand for Preservation of Evidence in relation to the incident at issue, which included a threat to file litigation. The department informs us the requestor is an attorney who represents two of the individuals involved in the incident at issue. The department does not affirmatively represent to this office the requestor’s correspondence is in compliance with the TTCA. Therefore, we will only consider the letter as a factor in determining whether the department reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Based on the representations of the department, our review of the submitted documents, and the totality of circumstances, we find the department has demonstrated it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the requests for information. We also find the department has established the remaining information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, the department may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, some of the information at issue involves alleged criminal activity. We note, information normally found on the front page of an offense or incident report is generally considered public. *Houston Chronicle Publishing 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 also* 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 the litigation. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). Thus, we find the basic offense information from the incident report may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Therefore, with the exception of basic information, the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.³

Generally, however, 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

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information, except to note basic information described in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Open Records No. 597 (1991).

information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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 basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) 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 <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,



Sean McCormick
Attorney
Open Records Division

SMC/eb

Ref: ID# 796144.

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)