



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 27, 2016

Ms. Criselda Palacios
City Attorney
The City of Edinburg
P.O. Box 1079
Edinburg, Texas 78540

OR2016-23993

Dear Ms. Palacios:

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# 632032.

The City of Edinburg (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the arrest of a named individual on a specified date.¹ The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹We note the city 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 that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²We assume 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

Article 2.139 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides:

A person stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under Section 49.04, 49.045, 49.07, or 49.08, Penal Code, is entitled to receive from a law enforcement agency employing the peace officer who made the stop or arrest a copy of any video made by or at the direction of the officer that contains footage of:

- (1) the stop;
- (2) the arrest;
- (3) the conduct of the person stopped during any interaction with the officer, including during the administration of a field sobriety test; or
- (4) a procedure in which a specimen of the person's breath or blood is taken.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.139. We note you have submitted video recordings made by or at the direction of officers employed by the city's police department (the "department") that contain footage of the requestor being stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under section 49.04 of the Penal Code and a procedure in which a specimen of the person's breath or blood is taken. *See* Penal Code § 49.04 ("A person commits an offense if the person is intoxicated while operating a motor vehicle in a public place."). Therefore, the requestor is entitled to receive a copy of the video recordings at issue pursuant to article 2.139 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Although you assert section 552.103 of the Government Code to withhold this 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 552.103 is a general exception under the Act, the requestor's statutory access under article 2.139 prevails and the city may not withhold the video recordings at issue under section 552.103. As you raise no further exceptions against disclosure of this information, the city must release it pursuant to article 2.139 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(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).

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.

You state, and provide supporting documentation showing, concurrent with the city's receipt of the instant request, the city received letters from an attorney stating he represents individual in reference to injuries she suffered as a result of the actions of the police officers involved in the incident at issue. The letter further demands the preservation of evidence. Thus, you state on the date the city received the requests for information, the city reasonably anticipated litigation to which the city would be a party. You do not affirmatively represent

to this office the notices of claim comply with the TTCA or an applicable ordinance; therefore, we will only consider the notices of claim as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Based on these representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the requests were received. We further find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the city may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, the submitted information 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 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 from the incident report 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, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code

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 information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, 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 (1982).

In summary, the city must release the video recordings at issue pursuant to article 2.139 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 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 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 black ink that reads "Katelyn Blackburn-Rader". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Katelyn Blackburn-Rader
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB-R/bhf

Ref: ID# 632032

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)