



STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BRAD D. SCHIMEL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Paul W. Connell
Deputy Attorney General

Delanie M. Breuer
Chief of Staff

17 W. Main Street
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, WI 53707-7857
www.doj.state.wi.us

Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
fergusonpm@doj.state.wi.us
608/266-1221
TTY 1-800-947-3529
FAX 608/267-2779

February 16, 2018

To Whom This May Concern:

In response to public records requests received by the Wisconsin Department of Justice (DOJ), a copy of DOJ's Division of Criminal Investigation (DCI) investigative case file for DCI's investigation into the January 4, 2018 shooting by Forest County Sheriff's Department Deputy Craig Justice, which resulted in the death of Brandon Cude, has been prepared for release. The Forest County district attorney determined there is no basis to prosecute the law enforcement officer involved, and DCI is releasing its case file pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 175.47(5)(b).

The DCI case in question is **18-78: Forest Co OID – Brandon O. Cude**. That investigative case file has been reviewed in preparation for public release, and a copy of the case file reports has been made available online on the Wisconsin Department of Justice's website at www.doj.state.wi.us/dci/officer-involved-critical-incident. Access to copies of related photographs, audio recordings, and video recordings may be obtained by contacting DOJ Communications Director John Koremenos at koremenosj@doj.state.wi.us.

Certain information has been redacted from the records, either because specifically required by law or pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. These redactions are described below. In addition, I have been mindful in preparing these records for release that the purpose of the Wisconsin public records law is to shed light on the workings of government and the official acts of public officers and employees. *Building and Constr. Trades Council v. Waunakee Comm. Sch. Dist.*, 221 Wis. 2d 575, 582, 585 N.W.2d 726 (Ct. App. 1998).

Well-established public policy recognizes the privacy rights of a deceased person's surviving loved ones. Cf. *National Archives and Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157, 168, 171-72 (2004). In preparing these records for release, I applied the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) public records balancing test and determined that the public interest in treating surviving loved ones of the deceased with respect for their privacy and dignity outweighed any public interest in disclosure of the following records:

- Names of family members interviewed or mentioned by others who were interviewed have been redacted to initials only, except where these individuals share the last name Cude, in which case just their first names were redacted to the initial.

- Other information that would identify these family members is also redacted, including dates of birth, home addresses, personal telephone numbers, employment information, vehicle information, and signatures for these individuals.
- Graphic images of Mr. Cude at the scene and during his subsequent autopsy.

In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in protecting the privacy of this family, and in facilitating cooperation with law enforcement in sensitive investigations, also outweighs any public interest in disclosure of the described records. *Cf. Linzmeyer v. Forcey*, 2002 WI 84, ¶ 38, 254 Wis. 2d 306, 646 N.W.2d 811.

In preparing these records for release, I also determined by application of the public records balancing test that the public interest in protecting the ability of law enforcement to gather information when conducting sensitive investigations and in protecting the privacy of citizens involved in those investigations outweighs any public interest in disclosure of information that could identify witnesses and other individuals referenced by witnesses. *Cf. Wis. Stat. § 19.31; Linzmeyer*, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41. Due to the sensitive and sometimes controversial nature of officer-involved shooting incidents, public disclosure of the full names and other identifying information for individuals interviewed or mentioned during interviews could expose these individuals to unwanted public scrutiny, criticism, or pressure from outside sources, which could have a chilling effect on future witnesses' willingness to come forward and cooperate with law enforcement in investigations of similar incidents. Accordingly, the following information has been redacted from the records prepared for release:

- Names of witnesses and others mentioned by individuals interviewed. (Initials for the names of these individuals were not redacted.)
- Other information that would identify the above individuals, including dates of birth, home addresses, personal telephone numbers, and employment information.

In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in avoiding unnecessary intrusion into the personal lives of persons collaterally mentioned in a law enforcement report outweighs any public interest in information about the conduct of governmental affairs. Furthermore, I determined that the public interest in protecting the privacy of these individuals, and in facilitating cooperation with law enforcement in sensitive investigations, also outweighs any public interest in disclosure of this described information. *Cf. Linzmeyer*, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶ 38.

In addition to the overall redactions set forth thus far, certain other specific types of redactions have been made from the records prior to public release, for the reasons explained below.

Birthdates and social security numbers of individual persons have been redacted to protect against identity theft or other unauthorized use following any subsequent disclosure. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a),

I concluded that the public policy in favor of protecting the confidentiality of this economically valuable individually identifiable information and preventing its misuse upon any subsequent disclosure, as well as the public policies outlined in Wis. Stat. §§ 801.19, 801.20, and 801.21, outweigh any public interest in disclosure of the dates of birth and social security numbers of individual persons.

Photographs of driver's licenses have been redacted pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 343.43(1)(f) and Wis. Admin. Code § Trans 102.205.

Pursuant to the federal Driver's Privacy Protection Act (DPPA), which prohibits release of personal information and highly restricted personal information in response to a public records request, personal information, as defined in DPPA, contained within the DCI records that was obtained from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (DOT) Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) database has been redacted. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 2721 et seq.; *New Richmond News v. City of New Richmond*, 2016 WI App 43, 881 N.W.2d 339.

Personal cell telephone numbers for public employees have been redacted from the records pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.36(10)(a). To the extent the numbers are not directly governed by Wis. Stat. § 19.36(10)(a), the numbers have been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in disclosure of this information is outweighed by the public interest in the expectation of privacy on the part of individuals in their personal lives. Additionally, well-established public policy recognizing the confidentiality and privacy of the personal contact information of an authority's employees is expressed in Wis. Stat. § 19.36(10)(a). I find that the same underlying public policy of protecting the confidentiality and privacy of personal contact information outweighs any public interest in disclosure of this information.

Home addresses and personal telephone numbers have been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in disclosure of this information is outweighed by the public interest in the expectation of privacy on the part of individuals in their personal lives and in protecting the sources of law enforcement information and in encouraging citizens to cooperate with law enforcement investigators without undue concern that their private lives will become public matters. *Cf.* Wis. Stat. § 19.31; *Linzmeier*, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41.

Information that indicates whether or not FBI records exist has been redacted pursuant to 28 C.F.R. §§ 20.21(c)(2) and 20.33, because disclosure of the existence or non-existence of FBI records impermissibly would indicate the existence or non-existence of federal criminal history.

Law enforcement records regarding a juvenile and other juvenile offense information have been redacted pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 938.396. To the extent such records and information are not directly governed by Wis. Stat. § 938.396, the records and information have been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. Well-established public policy recognizing the confidentiality and privacy of children and juveniles is expressed in Wis. Stat. § 938.396. I find that the same underlying public policy of protecting the

confidentiality and privacy of children and juveniles outweighs any public interest in disclosure of the redacted information. *See* Wis. Stat. § 938.396 (“Law enforcement agency records of juveniles may not be open to inspection or their contents disclosed” unless certain exceptions apply).

DCI report number *18-78/40* documents the receipt of investigative records provided by the county attorney’s office in Colorado County, Texas. These records, which relate to the Texas case that resulted in federal warrants for Mr. Cude, have been wholly redacted from the DOJ record release because the Colorado County (Texas) attorney’s office provided these copies to DOJ as a courtesy for law enforcement review only, with the understanding that they would not be redistributed outside DOJ. The county attorney in Texas would not have authorized provision of these records to DOJ without DOJ’s agreement to those conditions. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a), I determined there is a public interest in honoring the conditions under which the Texas investigative reports were provided to DOJ and in cooperating with the Colorado County (Texas) attorney’s office so as to encourage the current and future joint law enforcement efforts of our agencies. To not honor the conditions by disclosing the reports would preclude future record-sharing and significantly impair cooperative law enforcement efforts between DOJ and the Colorado County (Texas) county attorney’s office. I concluded that the public interest in effective investigation of crime and effective law enforcement, which is furthered by honoring the conditions under which the Colorado County (Texas) attorney’s office provided the reports to DOJ, outweighs any public interest in disclosure by DOJ of the report. *Cf. Linzmeyer*, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39. Additionally, the continued confidentiality of these records is material to an ongoing investigation and prosecution in Texas involving other defendants in their investigation, and release of these records at this time would compromise the ability of Texas authorities to gain cooperation from potential witnesses and would interfere with the ongoing investigation as well as any potential criminal prosecution(s). *Id.* ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41. In performing the public records balancing test, I concluded that the strong public interest in effectively investigating and prosecuting criminal activity and in protecting the integrity of the current investigation also outweigh any public interest in disclosing these records at this time. *Id.*; Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a).

Bank account numbers of individuals have been redacted pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.36(13). In addition, individual account numbers for health insurance and a DNR license have been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. Well-established public policy recognizing the confidentiality and privacy of financial identifying information and the protection of economically valuable information from misappropriation or misuse is expressed in Wis. Stat. § 19.36(13). I find that the same public interest in protecting financial identifying information from misappropriation or other misuse, protecting the confidentiality and privacy of financial information, and protecting the expectation of privacy on the part of individuals in their personal lives applies here. In applying the balancing test, I concluded that the public interest in protecting the redacted information, as well as the public policies outlined in Wis. Stat. §§ 801.19, 801.20, and 801.21, outweigh any public interest in disclosure.

Property tax records for individuals living in the vicinity of the officer-involved shooting incident, but who were not witnesses to the incident or otherwise involved, have

been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in disclosure of this information is outweighed by the public interest in the expectation of privacy on the part of these individuals in their personal lives.

Crime Laboratory records have been redacted pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 165.79(1). In accordance with Wis. Stat. § 165.79(1), information present within DCI case reports that discloses what analyses were performed by the Crime Laboratory and the results of those analyses also has been redacted from the records prior to release.

Information containing specific details regarding weapons assigned to law enforcement personnel has been redacted to preserve the safety, security, and effectiveness of the law enforcement officers. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a), I determined that the public interest in effective investigation of crime and protection of public safety, including protecting the ability of law enforcement to respond in emergency situations without jeopardizing officer safety or undermining officer effectiveness by revealing their equipment and techniques, outweighs any public interest in disclosure. *Cf.* Wis. Stat. § 19.31; *Linzmeier*, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39, 41.

Specific information identifying routine shifts worked by law enforcement officers has been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test in the interest of preserving the safety of the officers, the officers' families, and the officers' homes. In performing the balancing test, I determined that the public interest in protecting the security of the officers, the officers' families, and the officers' homes outweighs any public interest in information regarding their routine shifts. Details regarding the specific shifts worked by the officers involved in the January 4, 2018 shooting incident have not been redacted from the records.

The street address for an office where DCI agents work at a confidential location shared by undercover agents has been redacted pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test to protect the safety of these agents and the ability of these agents to effectively investigate crime in undercover capacities. I determined that the public interest in protecting the confidentiality of this location, so that undercover agents can effectively investigate criminal activity, outweighs any public interest in disclosure of this confidential street address. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1); *Linzmeier*, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶ 41.

Emergency medical services personnel working with Pickerel Rescue and the Antigo Fire Department responded to the shooting scene to provide medical care for Mr. Cude. Specific information regarding their assessment and treatment of Mr. Cude, as observed or reported by the EMS personnel, including in the audio portion of video recordings, has been redacted from the records in accordance with Wis. Stat. §§ 256.15(12) and 146.82(5)(c). To the extent the information is not directly governed by Wis. Stat. §§ 256.15(12) and 146.82(5)(c), in applying the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test, I find that the same underlying public policy of protecting the confidentiality and privacy of personal medical information, as well

as the analogous restrictions on release of patient treatment information described under Wis. Stat. § 256.15(12), outweigh any public interest in disclosure of this information.

Copies of Pickerel Rescue and Antigo Fire Department EMS reports contained within the DCI case file have been redacted pursuant to Wis. Stat. §§ 256.15(12) and 146.82(5)(c) except for the information authorized for release by Wis. Stat. § 256.15(12)(b). In view of the strong public policy protecting the confidentiality of personal medical information expressed in Wis. Stat. 146.82(5)(c), and in accordance with Wis. Stat. § 256.15(12), excerpts from these reports have also been redacted where present within related DCI case reports. In applying the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test, I find that the same underlying public policy of protecting the confidentiality and privacy of personal medical information, as well as the analogous restrictions on release of patient treatment information described under Wis. Stat. § 256.15(12), outweigh any public interest in disclosure of this information.

In addition, specific information regarding life-saving attempts made for Mr. Cude by law enforcement officers at the scene, as reported by those providing the treatment or captured in body camera video recordings, has been redacted from the records pursuant to the Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) balancing test. Well-established public policy recognizing the confidentiality and privacy of personal medical information is expressed in Wis. Stat. § 146.82. I find that the same underlying public policy of protecting the confidentiality and privacy of personal health information, as well as the analogous restrictions on release of patient treatment information described under Wis. Stat. § 256.15(12), outweigh any public interest in disclosure of the redacted information.

DCI reports numbered *18-78/41* and *18-78/44* document DOJ's receipt of autopsy and toxicology records for Mr. Cude, provided by the Forest County Medical Examiner's Office. The DCI reports have been included with the released records; however, the attached records, provided by the medical examiner's office, along with excerpts from those reports included within the DCI report narratives, have been wholly redacted from the release. Those records were provided to DOJ by the Forest County Medical Examiner's Office on the condition that the records would not be shared with any person outside the criminal investigation, and the medical examiner's office would not provide the records to DOJ without DOJ's agreement to those conditions. In performing the public records balancing test pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a), I determined there is a public interest in honoring the conditions under which the medical examiner's records were provided to DOJ and in cooperating with the medical examiner's office so as to encourage the current and future joint law enforcement efforts of our agencies. To not honor the conditions by disclosing the records would preclude future record-sharing and significantly impair cooperative law enforcement efforts between DOJ and the Forest County Medical Examiner's Office. I concluded that the public interest in effective investigation of crime and effective law enforcement, which is furthered by honoring the conditions under which the Forest County Medical Examiner's Office provided the records to DOJ, outweighs any public interest in disclosure by DOJ of the records. *Cf. Linzmeyer*, 254 Wis. 2d 306, ¶¶ 30, 32, 39. If desired, the medical examiner's records may be requested directly from the Forest County Medical Examiner's Office records custodian.

Only one copy of records for which duplicate copies exist has been included with the records prepared for release. *Stone v. Bd. of Regents*, 2007 WI App 223, ¶ 20, 305 Wis. 2d 679, 741 N.W.2d 774.

As documented in the DCI case file, body camera recordings from the officer involved in this incident, as well as from three other officers who responded to the scene of the officer-involved shooting, were collected by DCI for review. Due to space constraints, the large investigatory file, and the time necessary to review this material, videos that do not depict scenes of investigatory interest are not included in this release. DCI's review of these recordings is documented in individual reports within the DCI case file. You may request additional materials by specifying what you are looking for by report number. This request should be made through ordinary public records channels and will be processed accordingly.

The law permits DOJ to impose fees for certain “actual, necessary and direct” costs associated with responding to public records requests. Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3). Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(f), DOJ may require prepayment for the costs of locating (if applicable), copying, and mailing the requested records if the total amount exceeds \$5.00. Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(3)(e), in this instance, DOJ is waiving its fees, and therefore, the records are being made available online at this time without any payment required.

Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(4)(b), this determination is subject to review by mandamus under Wis. Stat. § 19.37(1) or upon application to a district attorney or the Attorney General.

Sincerely,



Paul M. Ferguson
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Open Government

PMF:kas