From: **April Nipp** [redacted]
Subject: Fax ORR [redacted]
Date: January 20, 2026 at 3:17 PM
To: Kyle Moring [redacted]

AN

Mr. Morning,
Attached you will find the request received via fax, the complete Offense Report for [redacted], the complete Call for Service, the last Report Log received and the most recent requested Report Log, and our agencies policies that cover
[Excluded-case detail omitted]

I will answer each requested item in numerical order as listed in your request.

1. Previously provided Report Log was for the timeframe of 09/19/2025 to 12/03/2025. The last provided log was for 11/20/2025 to 12/03/2025, that log is attached. Also attached is the most recent and up to date Report Log.
2. (a) No such records exist.
   (b) There was no communication between Detective Odom and DFPS or CPS. Any paperwork generated by CPS is confidential and needs to be requested from their office.
   (c) No such records exist.
   (d) No such records exist.
3. No such records exist.
   [Excluded-case detail omitted]

   (b) No such policy.
   (c) No such policy.
5. [Excluded-case detail omitted]
   Therefore, the complete Offense Report is attached. There are no supplements for this report.
6. The complete Call for Service is attached.
7. (a) Previously, emails were provided with all communication between you and Detective Odom. There are no additional emails. If needed, those emails can be requested again from the City of Mount Pleasant.
   (b) Initial contact between you and Detective Odom is noted in his Narrative. No additional contact attempts were made.
8. (a) All communication Detective Odom had with parties involved are noted in his Narrative. Complete Offense Report is attached.
   (b) No such records exist.
   (c) No such records exist.

Let me know if you have any questions.
Thank you!

April Nipp
Records Manager
Mount Pleasant Police Dept.
501 North Madison Ave.
Mount Pleasant, TX 75455
[redacted]

Reading copy | selected source page 85 | personal identifiers removed

I recognize that the Bailey–Nipp exchange was visible in the March 17 scanned production, which is how I identified the omission. But the March 17 scan did not constitute a complete native production of the email thread with its attachments, and the Bailey–Nipp exchange did not appear in the March 31 twenty-three-email production. It was not produced in complete/native form with attachments until April 5.

These materials were not merely copies of my own email correspondence. They were a DA–MPPD email exchange and DA-maintained attachments transmitted from MPPD to TCDA. Even if one attachment consists of a statement I previously provided, it was responsive because it was maintained by TCDA as an attachment to a law enforcement communication and because my February 27 request expressly included attachments maintained in DA files, accounts, or systems even where TCDA was not the original sender.

The April 5 production confirms that responsive records existed, were in TCDA's possession before Mr. Bailey's March 31 representation, and had not been included in the March 31 production.

6. The April 5 attachments also bear directly on the companion City § 552.3215 complaint Mr. Bailey was reviewing

The April 5 production is material not only because it was responsive to my TCDA request. It is also material because the same City/MPPD records bear directly on my companion § 552.3215 complaint concerning the City of Mount Pleasant's handling of my public-information requests.

The clearest example is a DFPS record. In its January 20, 2026 written response to me, the City/MPPD represented that "[t]here was no communication between Detective Odom and DFPS or CPS," and answered related items "No such records exist." That representation is materially contradicted by a DFPS "Notification to Law Enforcement of a Non-DFPS Criminal Matter" (Intake No. [redacted]), addressed on its face "TO: Mount Pleasant Pd," together with the DFPS confirmation email of September 5, 2025 and the DFPS determination email of September 6, 2025, all of which later appeared in the MPPD case packet that April Nipp transmitted to Mr. Bailey. That DFPS material was never produced to me by the City or MPPD in any PIA response. It surfaced only on April 5, 2026, embedded at pages 14–21 of the "Moring Statement.pdf" case packet that MPPD Records Manager April Nipp had emailed to Mr. Bailey on February 6, 2026. In other words, the record that materially contradicts the City's "no communication" and "no such records exist" representations reached me only through the District Attorney's production in this matter — not from the City. (See Exhibit F at Bates L260017200-0073 to -0080 (Moring Statement.pdf, pp. 14–21); Exhibit G at Bates L260017200-0085 and -0087.)

The April 17 determination recognizes that, on November 17, 2025, I made a complaint to TCDA under § 552.3215 concerning requests for information made to the City of Mount Pleasant, and that TCDA did not issue its preliminary determination on that complaint until April

16, 2026. Thus, when Ms. Nipp transmitted the complete MPPD report and attachments to Mr. Bailey on February 6, 2026, the City complaint was pending before TCDA and remained pending for more than two additional months.

The records Ms. Nipp transmitted to Mr. Bailey — the MPPD offense/incident report, the case-packet compilation containing the DFPS material, and the "Dismissal of Complainant" form — overlap with records or record categories I sought from the City and that the City represented did not exist, were not maintained, or had not been created. The "Dismissal of Complainant" form, in particular, was not among the records MPPD produced to me, yet Mr. Bailey held it (Ex. F, Bates L260017200-0081). The City has still not produced the DFPS material or the "Dismissal of Complainant" form to me in any PIA response, and has not produced the MPPD case packet in the complete form transmitted to TCDA.

That overlap is significant. Mr. Bailey was reviewing whether the City had violated Chapter 552 while, in his own DA files, he possessed City/MPPD records bearing on the accuracy of the City's nonexistence and production representations. The issue is not whether your office should decide the City complaint here. The issue is that the omitted DA-maintained records were material both to my TCDA request and to Mr. Bailey's review of the City complaint.

This further supports revision of the April 17 determination. The determination treated TCDA's violation as cured based on TCDA's representation that all responsive information had been released. But the later-produced Bailey–Nipp attachments show that TCDA possessed records that were responsive to my request, omitted from the March 31 production, and material to a related § 552.3215 review then pending before Mr. Bailey. Under those circumstances, TCDA's completeness representation should not be accepted without a documented, adequate search.

7. The video-evidence issue warrants adequate-search verification

The April 5 production also leaves an unresolved search issue. Ms. Nipp's February 6 email expressly asked Mr. Bailey whether he wanted the videos as well. The records produced to date show the question, but not its resolution.

I ask that your office request or obtain a verified supplemental response from TCDA addressing whether any responsive record exists showing whether Mr. Bailey or TCDA accepted, declined, received, transmitted, reviewed, or otherwise disposed of Ms. Nipp's offer to provide the videos. If no such responsive record exists, TCDA should say so after a documented search.

8. A related inconsistency in the companion City matter further supports requiring verification rather than reliance on representation alone

In the City § 552.3215 matter, Mr. Bailey represented on April 16, 2026 that his office was "in communication with the city attorney for the City of Mt. Pleasant to evaluate the status of the city's response" to my complaints. (The underlying document appears to bear a 2025 date, but