



**LONDON N. BREED**  
MAYOR

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
**POLICE DEPARTMENT**  
HEADQUARTERS  
1245 3<sup>RD</sup> Street  
San Francisco, California 94158



**WILLIAM SCOTT**  
CHIEF OF POLICE

March 10, 2023

Via email [94464-83040317@requests.muckrock.com](mailto:94464-83040317@requests.muckrock.com)

RE: Public Records Request, dated June 5, 2020, Reference #P012174-060520

Dear Anonymous,

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received your Public Records Act request, dated June 5, 2020. This response is specific to body camera only.

*1. All bodycam footage from (inclusive) May 30 to June 4, 2020 of any incident of police use of force including but not limited to:*

- (a) use of a firearm,*
- (b) use of a baton or body weapon,*
- (c) use of tasers/less lethal weapons,*
- (d) use of bean bags,*
- (e) use of tear gas,*
- (f) any other use of force that resulted in any injury to any person other than a peace officer.*

And

*4. All bodycam footage from (inclusive) May 30 to June 4, 2020 of any of the incidents queried in request 3 above.*

You narrowed request #1 as follows:

*Request 1 here is narrowed to the following (please prioritize (a) and (b) over request 4 and the other here - they are the most urgent):*

- a. 200335459*
- b. June 2, 2020 footage of Ofc McHale #1458 has a bad case number "20032913" which appears to be a typo missing a number, which states a 31 yo White Female was injured.*
- c. 200337643*
- d. 200330982*
- e. 200337091*
- f. 200339699*
- g. 200333760*
- h. 200339887*
- i. 200337524*
- j. 200337483*
- k. 200327735*
- l. 200330330*
- m. 200330261*
- n. 200828385*
- o. 200328460*

p. 200330352

q. 200328012

Please be advised that CLETS (California Law Enforcement Telecommunications Systems) data, along with victim and witness private information has been redacted pursuant to Cal. Gov't. Code §6254(f) and Penal Code §11105 et. seq., Cal. Gov't. Code §6254(c), §6254(k) and Cal. Evidence Code §1040.

Listed below is/are a link(s) to view the Body Worn Camera Video(s) related to Incident #200339699. Referenced next to the link(s) is/are Officer Name(s), Date(s) Recorded, Time Frame Video(s) Recorded, and Redactions made.

The link(s) will expire in thirty (30) calendar days. If you do not view or download the video within the allotted timeframe, the link will automatically expire, and you will need to resubmit your request.

[\[Click here to download\]](#)

Officer Name	Date	Time Video Recorded	SFPD Incident #	CAD#	File Size
Mark Milligan	6/4/20	10:58 PM	200339887	201563567	48.4 MB
Code	Time				
1	00:00:00 - 00:00:32				
1	00:00:44 - 00:01:43				
3	00:00:47 - 00:00:50				
1	00:01:49 - 00:01:50				
1	00:01:50 - 00:01:51				
1	00:02:03 - 00:02:41				
1	00:02:04 - 00:02:04				
1	00:02:04 - 00:02:05				
1	00:02:12 - 00:02:16				
1	00:02:12 - 00:02:21				
1	00:02:20 - 00:02:37				
1	00:02:35 - 00:02:37				
1	00:02:37 - 00:02:41				
1	00:02:42 - 00:02:48				
1	00:02:47 - 00:02:55				
1	00:02:48 - 00:03:15				
1	00:03:22 - 00:03:25				
1	00:03:42 - 00:03:45				
1	00:04:13 - 00:04:16				

Redaction #	Exemption
1	California Penal Code § 11105 et. seq. - CORI data (personal identifiable criminal history) and CLETS data (California Law Enforcement Telecommunications Systems).

2	California Government Code § 6254(f), which exempts from disclosure records of complaints to, investigations conducted by intelligence information or security procedures of, and investigatory or security files compiled by local police agencies.
3	California Government Code §6254(c) – Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
4	California Government Code §6254(k) - Records, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including, but not limited to, provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege.
5	S.F. Administrative Code section 67.24(d)(2) - Personal or otherwise private information related to or unrelated to the investigation if disclosure would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.
6	California Evidence Code § 1040 (a) - As used in this section, official information means information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duty and not open, or officially disclosed, to the public prior to the time the claim of privilege is made.

SFPD must balance its duty to respond to public records requests with its duty to perform the broad range of tasks performed by SFPD personnel that result in keeping the peace and maintaining safety in our communities. Responding to your request will be quite burdensome and time-consuming, especially when coupled with our duty also to respond to like public records requests from others. SFPD will not be able to respond within the customary time frame without unreasonably impinging on its ability to perform its other duties.

It is in this rare circumstance that we find it necessary to invoke a rule of reason to guide the timing of our response to your public records request. As the City Attorney has stated on pages 97-98 of the *Good Government Guide*, which is available on the City Attorney's website, the law recognizes that when there is a conflict between a department's performance of its wide range of duties, and its responsibilities under public records laws, reason demands flexibility in the timing of responses to requests.

Under this rule and given the SFPD's other public obligations, we will not be able to devote an unlimited amount of staff time to your request and like requests. Nevertheless, we intend to provide a complete response to your request, but it will take longer than ordinarily is the case.

Over time, we expect this backlog problem to recede, and expect to be able to move more quickly on requests such as yours, particularly if the records being sought have already been reviewed in order to respond to an earlier request. We intend to provide records in response to your request, and other like requests, on a rolling basis. We will provide you with a brief update by Friday, March 24, 2023.

Please let me know if you have any questions pertaining to this letter, or any suggestions you might have that could expedite our response to your request.

Sincerely,

Lieutenant Christopher Beauchamp #561  
Officer in Charge  
Risk Management - Legal Division