



March 27, 2002

Mr. David Anderson
General Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 N. Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2002-1508

Dear Mr. Anderson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 162642.

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for reports by master Robert Spoonmore relating to the North Forest Independent School District, and for documents and correspondence concerning the Harris County District Attorney's investigation into the North Forest Independent School District. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.

Section 552.108, the "law enforcement exception," provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) [i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of 552.021 if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation or prosecution of crime; [or] (2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. . . .

(b) [a]n 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; [or] (2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. . . .

This office has held that a governmental agency that is not a law enforcement agency may withhold records from disclosure under section 552.108 in limited circumstances. For example, records that otherwise qualify for the section 552.108 exception, such as documentary evidence in a police file on a pending case, do not necessarily lose that status while in the custody of an agency not directly involved with law enforcement. Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1-2 (1981). Similarly, in construing the statutory predecessor to section 552.108, this office concluded that if an investigation by an administrative agency reveals possible criminal conduct that the agency intends to report or already has reported to the appropriate law enforcement agency, then section 552.108 will apply to the information gathered by the administrative agency if its release would unduly interfere with law enforcement. Open Records Decision No. 493 at 2 (1988) (construing predecessor statute).

You enclose a letter from the Harris County District Attorney's Office, that explains that the documents at issue are related to an ongoing criminal investigation. Additionally, you relate that Mr. Lott, Lieutenant/Investigator, has indicated to the agency by telephone that releasing the requested documents would interfere with his pending investigation. As the proper custodian of the information, you have invoked section 552.108 and shown that release of the requested information 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 493 (1988). Therefore, we conclude that the requested information may be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1).

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 Texas Building and Procurement 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



VG Schimmel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VGS/sdk

Ref: ID# 162462

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jocelyn Lane
Managing Editor
FOX 26 Investigates
4261 Southwest Freeway
Houston, TX 77027-7201
(w/o enclosures)