



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 4, 2020

Ms. Alexandra Golden
Assistant District Attorney
Brazoria County
111 East Locust, Suite 408A
Angleton, Texas 77515

OR2020-19424

Dear Ms. Golden:

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# 838376 (Ref. No. 20-0669).

The Brazoria County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for the entire investigative file related to a specified cause number. You state the district attorney's office will redact certain information under sections 552.130(c) and 552.136(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a police officer's 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 provides, in relevant part, the following:

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 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

(a) 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 of the Occupations Code, 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 [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 note the remaining information includes a CR-3 accident report. Section 550.065 of the Transportation Code applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator’s accident report), .062 (officer’s accident report). An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). However, a governmental entity shall release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). *Id.* § 550.065(c), (c-1). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c). In this instance, the requestor is a person listed under section 550.065(c). Although you assert section 552.111 to withhold the information, a statutory right of access prevails over the Act’s general exceptions to public disclosure. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exception to disclosure under the Act). Because section 552.111 is a general exception under the Act, the requestor’s statutory access under section 550.065(c) prevails and the district attorney’s office may not withhold the information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Thus, the district attorney’s office must release the accident report to this requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code.

Next, we note the remaining information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of “information that is also contained in a public court record[,]” unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17). You

seek to withhold the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the attorney work product privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code. We note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992). Therefore, no portion of the submitted court-filed documents may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Additionally, section 552.111 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Gov't Code § 552.007; see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The attorney work product privilege is also found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. The Texas Supreme Court has held "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). However, the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure apply only to "actions of a civil nature." *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 2. Thus, because the requested documents relate to a criminal case, the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure does not apply, and the district attorney's office may not withhold the information at issue on that basis. However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency 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); ORD 677 at 4-8. 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
- (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). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating 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 also *United States v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 236 (1975). In *Curry*, the Texas Supreme Court determined a request for a district attorney’s “entire file” was “too broad” and, citing *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 460 (Tex. 1993), held “the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney’s thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case.” *Id.* at 380. Accordingly, if a requestor seeks an attorney’s entire litigation file, and a governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation, we will presume the entire file is excepted from disclosure under the attorney work product aspect of section 552.111. Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996) (organization of attorney’s litigation file necessarily reflects attorney’s thought processes (citing *Nat'l Union*, 863 S.W.2d at 461)). However, we note the court in *National Union* also concluded a specific document is not automatically considered to be privileged simply because it is part of an attorney’s file. 863 S.W.2d at 461. The court held an opposing party may request specific documents or categories of documents that are relevant to the case without implicating the attorney work product privilege. *Id.*; ORD 647 at 5.

You assert the remaining information encompasses the district attorney’s entire litigation file concerning a case that was pending when the district attorney’s office received the request. We find the request at issue constitutes a request for an “entire” litigation file for purposes of the *Curry* decision. Thus, we agree the district attorney’s office may withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.²

In summary, the submitted body worn camera recordings were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code and they need not be released. The district attorney’s office must release the accident report to this requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. The district attorney’s office must release the court-filed documents we have marked under section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. The district attorney’s office may withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this 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,

Alexandra C. Burks
Attorney
Open Records Division

ACB/jm

Ref: ID# 838376

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)