September 2026 complaint-status correspondence

Public reading copy prepared from the supplied correspondence. Personal contact details, law-firm boilerplate and attachment contents are omitted. Names, dates, subjects and substantive message text are retained.

September 13 · OR2026-018153

From Charles C. Bailey, Titus County District Attorney, to Austin Beck and Lea Ream; Kyle Moring copied. Subject: Re: Kyle Moring Complaint Dated August 13, 2026.

Mr. Beck: I sent the referenced complaint to you on August 13, 2026. We discussed the matter on August 28, 2026, while you were here in Mt. Pleasant on another matter. Please advise immediately why I should not enter a finding that this ruling of the Attorney General has not been complied with by the City of Mt. Pleasant.

September 13 · OR2026-027532

From Charles C. Bailey to Austin Beck and Lea Ream; Kyle Moring copied. Subject: Re: Kyle Moring Complaint #2 Dated August 13, 2026.

Bailey sent the same substantive compliance inquiry concerning the second complaint and again referenced the August 28 discussion in Mount Pleasant.

September 14 · City responses

For OR2026-018153, Beck wrote that the City had located responsive files and the related OAG ruling, was separating material to be withheld, and expected to deliver the releasable documents by close of business September 15.

For OR2026-027532, Beck wrote that the City had located responsive files, many containing governmental bank account or routing numbers requiring redaction, and expected to make releasable documents available by close of business September 16.

September 15–16 · Productions

On September 15, Beck transmitted information he described as responsive and releasable under OR2026-018153. On September 16, the City transmitted the OR2026-027532 production in multiple parts. Kyle’s contemporaneous reply reported that Part 1 had not arrived with its attachment when Part 2 was received and asked that the missing part be resent and that the City confirm whether the three parts included all responsive information and referenced attachments.

This packet documents Bailey’s compliance inquiries, the City’s responses and the subsequent transmissions. It does not contain a written determination by Bailey on either complaint.