



February 23, 2001

Ms. Tracy B. Calabrese  
Senior Assistant City Attorney  
City of Houston  
P.O. Box 1562  
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2001-0668

Dear Ms. Calabrese:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 144454.

The Houston Police Department (the “department”) received a request for all mobile data terminal transmissions, dispatch tapes and logs, 911 tapes, call slips and the offense report in a specified criminal case. The requestor also asks for all writings and electronic recordings pertaining to routine investigative procedures for the offense of murder. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information and representative samples of information.<sup>1</sup>

You assert that the offense report, computer-aided dispatch information, mobile data transmissions, and dispatch tapes that are submitted as Exhibits 2, 3, 4, and 5 are excepted under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime if release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. You state that the requested information relates to a pending criminal prosecution. Accordingly, we find that release of Exhibits 2, 3, 4, and 5 would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases).

---

<sup>1</sup>In reaching our conclusion here, we assume that the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

However, section 552.108 is inapplicable to basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). We believe such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. 531 S.W.2d at 177. Thus, with the exception of the basic front page offense and arrest information, you may withhold Exhibits 2, 3, 4, and 5 under section 552.108(a)(1).

You also assert that Exhibit 6 is excepted under section 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) provides as follows:

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). This office has stated that certain procedural information may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code, or its statutory predecessors. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed use of force guidelines), 456 (1987) (forms indicating location of off-duty police officers), 413 (1984) (security measures to be used at next execution), 143 (1976) (specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime). To claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection, however, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining, if the requested information does not supply the explanation on its face, how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force are not protected under section 552.108), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention).

You have provided an affidavit of a police officer who explains that revealing specific homicide division standard operating procedures would impair the ability of the department to investigate and assist in the prosecution of homicides. Specifically, the police officer contends that revelation of the procedures would allow a perpetrator to anticipate what investigators are looking for and alter the crime scene as well as anticipate interrogation issues. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that the department may withhold procedures 200/1.02, 200/1.04, 200/2.02, and 200/2.04 in their entirety, and items 2, 4, and 5 in procedure 200/1.01 and item 3 in procedure 200/2.01 under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. We have marked the information that you may withhold. You must release the remaining information in Exhibit 6.

In conclusion, you may withhold Exhibits 2, 3, 4, and 5, with the exception of basic information, under section 552.108(a)(1). Further, you may withhold the marked portions of Exhibit 6 under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. As we are able to make these determinations under section 552.108, we need not address section 552.130 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jennifer H. Bialek  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JHB/er

Ref: ID# 144454

Encl: Submitted documents and tapes

cc: Mr. Neal Davis  
DeGuerin & Dickson  
Attorneys at Law  
Seventh Floor, The Republic Building  
1018 Preston Avenue  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)