



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 25, 2020

Mr. Brent Haynes
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Galveston County
600 59th Street, Suite 1001
Galveston, Texas 77551

OR2020-09264

Dear Mr. Haynes:

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# 818297.

The Galveston County Criminal District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for four categories of information pertaining to a specified incident and two named individuals.¹ We understand you will redact information under sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code.² You state you are releasing some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ We note the district attorney's office sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

² We note 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

The district attorney's office asserts a portion of the submitted information is not subject to the Act because it consists of records of the grand jury and is held by the district attorney's office solely as an agent of the grand jury. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411, 398 (1983). Thus, because the information at issue is held by the district attorney's office as an agent of the grand jury, this information consists of records of the judiciary not subject to disclosure under the Act. Therefore, the district attorney's office is not required to release the information at issue in response to the instant request.³

Next, we note the remaining information includes city 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 at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.⁴ 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 the district attorney's office has redacted public citizens' dates of birth. You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be

³ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

⁴ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the district attorney's office should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

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[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, 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). You state the information at issue relates to a pending criminal prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the remaining information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publishing 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). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code is applicable to Exhibits A-E, H-3, and H-4.

However, we note, and you acknowledge, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information does not include dates of birth or motor vehicle record information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, which you state you are releasing, the district attorney's office may withhold Exhibits A-E, H-3, and H-4 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁵

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” *See* Gov't Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note basic information is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *Id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that:

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193,207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

The work product doctrine under section 552.111 of the Government Code is applicable to litigation files in criminal and civil litigation. *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. 1994); *see U.S. v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 236 (1975). Upon review, we find you failed to establish the basic information consists of material prepared, mental impressions developed, or a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for the district attorney's office or representatives of the district attorney's office. Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the basic information as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege.

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 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. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). Upon review, the district attorney's office must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we

find the district attorney's office has failed to demonstrate any of the basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the basic information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the submitted body worn camera recordings at issue were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code and need not be released to this requestor in response to this request for information. The district attorney's office is not required to release the grand jury records in response to the instant request. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the district attorney's office may withhold Exhibits A-E, H-3, and H-4 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district attorney'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.

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,

Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/eb

Ref: ID# 818297

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)