



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 15, 2003

Ms. Pamela Smith
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P. O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2003-5735

Dear Ms. Smith:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 186018.

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received a request for copies of all complaints and performance reviews on a named department officer. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code and rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you have also claimed section 552.022 as an exception to disclosure. Section 552.022 does not provide exceptions to the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Rather, it makes certain categories of information expressly public and subject to disclosure under the Act. Section 552.022 provides in part that

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

- (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted documents include completed performance evaluations, progress reports, and information regarding completed investigations. Such information must be released under section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is expressly confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108.

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

(a) Information 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[.]

Generally, a governmental body claiming an exception under section 552.108 must reasonably explain 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(b)(1); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You explain that the individual whose information is at issue was the arresting officer in a DWI case that is currently pending in the Fort Bend County Court. You state that the requested information “may be used as evidence in [the defendant’s] upcoming criminal trial since it relates directly to the employment history of the law enforcement officer who arrested him.” Finally, you state, and provide documentation showing, that the Assistant District Attorney for Fort Bend County who will be prosecuting this case has stated that release of the requested information “would interfere with the criminal prosecution of [the defendant] by the Fort Bend County District Attorney’s office.” Based on your representations and our review of the information, we agree 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); Open Records Decision No. 216 (1978). Accordingly, we conclude that the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1).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

¹As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining claimed exception.

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 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,



Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 186018

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Gerard J. Kipping
1204 Gerona
Rosenberg, Texas 77471
(w/o enclosures)