



Nathan Vasquez, Multnomah County District Attorney

1200 SW 1st Avenue, Suite 5200, Portland, OR 97204-1193
P: (503) 988-3162 | F: (503) 988-3643 | www.mcda.us

February 2, 2026

via email only

Michele Jacoby
redisrare@outlook.com

Re: Petition of Michele Jacoby seeking body camera footage from the City of Gresham

Dear Ms. Jacoby,

You submitted a request to this office on January 27, 2026 in which you ask that we order the City of Gresham to release certain police body camera footage. The underlying encounter occurred on November 27, 2025 and documents Gresham Police Officer Bush's service of two restraining orders on you. On January 19, 2026, you submitted a request to the City for the body camera footage, precisely identifying the date, time, and officer whose footage you sought.

On January 20, 2026 the City denied your request, citing ORS 192.345(40), the public records exemption for police body camera recordings. ORS 192.345(40) conditionally exempts from disclosure under the public records law, "[a]udio or video recordings, whether digital or analog, resulting from a law enforcement officer's operation of a video camera worn upon the officer's person that records the officer's interactions with members of the public while the officer is on duty."

It is not in reasonable dispute that the record you seek fits within this description. As a result, the exemption applies unless a public interest exists that outweighs the legislatively expressed interest in confidentiality for body camera footage. A public interest is present when "the furnishing of the record has utility—indeed, its greatest utility—to the community or society as a whole." *In Defense of Animals v. OHSU*, 199 Or App 160, 189 (2005).

In your petition you state that you believe there were defects in the service of the paperwork, you are under a court filing deadline, and wish to use the footage as evidence to challenge the restraining orders. You further argue that there is "a compelling public interest in ensuring police accountability and the integrity of the judicial process."

A private interest in disclosure accompanied by blanket statements about transparency and accountability does not equate to the type of public interest intended by the legislature. *Petition of Scholten*, MCDA PRO 25-82 (2025) ("A generalized interest in transparency is insufficient to override a legislatively created exception to the public records law.") See also, *Petition of Capone*, MCDA PRO 25-53 (2025) ("[t]hat a requestor seeks records pertaining to themselves, their family, or their business is strong, and usually dispositive, evidence that the interest advanced by release is primarily a private interest.") *Petition of Shore*, MCDA PRO 17-53 (2017) (request relating to a "discrete incident involving [requestor] and the public agency" was a "quintessential personal interest request"); *Petition of Covington*, MCDA PRO 24-60 (2024) (allegation that police officer violated requestor's First Amendment rights does not establish public interest to overcome ORS 192.345(40)); ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PUBLIC RECORDS AND MEETINGS MANUAL (2024) at 19 ("If

Page 2

February 2, 2026

Petition of Michele Jacoby

a requester seeks records relating to the requester, a mere allegation that the public body has treated the individual oppressively, absent a broader public interest, does not satisfy the public interest standard.”)

Here you are expressly seeking records of a police action involving yourself in furtherance of a private legal claim. The City of Gresham did not err in its application of the law to your public records request.

ORDER

Accordingly, the petition is denied.

Regards,

NATHAN VASQUEZ
District Attorney
Multnomah County, Oregon

By: 

Adam Gibbs
General Counsel

Cc: sherisa davis-larry, City of Gresham

26-05