



June 20, 2002

Lieutenant Arturo Valdez
Central Records Division
McAllen Police Department
P.O. Box 220
McAllen, Texas 78502-0220

OR2002-3348

Dear Lt. Valdez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 164626.

The City of McAllen Police Department (the “department”) received a request for a specific case file. You indicate that the department has released some of the responsive information. However, you claim that the remainder of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have also received arguments in favor of the release of the requested information from the requestor’s representative. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.304. We have considered all of the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime

(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 [required public disclosure] if:

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

Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) or (b)(1) must reasonably explain, if the information does not supply the explanation on its face, how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(a); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the requested offense report relates to a pending criminal investigation. The requestor's representative contends that the case at issue is an inactive, "cold case" and is unlikely to be prosecuted. Thus, we are faced with a factual dispute concerning whether the department was engaging in a pending investigation of the case at the time of the request. We cannot resolve disputes of fact in the open records process, and therefore, we must rely on the representations of the governmental body requesting our opinion. Open Records Decision Nos. 554 (1990), 552 (1990). Based upon the department's representation that the investigation is still pending, we conclude that the release of the submitted 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).

We note, however, that the requestor's representative contends that the department waived its section 552.108 claim by releasing to the public a videotape and other information concerning the case. We agree that, to the extent the police department has already released information about the case to the public, it may not now withhold that information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.007. Thus, to the extent the department has already released information about this case to the public, it must release the same information to the requestor.

Furthermore, we note that information normally found on the front page of an offense report is generally considered public. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.108(c); *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); Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). Thus, the department must release the types of information that are considered to be front page offense report information, even if this information is not actually located on the front page of the offense report.

In summary, the department must release responsive information it has already made available to the public as well as basic information about the crime. The department may withhold the remainder of the submitted information 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); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. 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,



Nathan E. Bowden
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 164626

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Brian G. Janis
100 North Expressway 83
Brownsville, Texas 78521-2284
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Emma Perez-Treviño
The Brownsville Herald
1135 East Van Buren Street
Brownsville, Texas 78520
(w/o enclosures)