



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 2, 2004

Mr. Larry L. Foerster
Darden, Fowler and Creighton, L.L.P.
414 West Phillips, Suite 100
Conroe, Texas 77301-2880

OR2004-1549

Dear Mr. Foerster:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 197008.

The Splendora Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for forty-seven items of information pertaining to Cause Number 03-07-05346, a particular K-9 officer, and certain departmental procedures. You state that some responsive information has been provided to the requestor.¹ You state that the department does not have any documents responsive to item 40 of the request.² You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the

¹Although you state that an officer's personnel file has been released with information redacted under section 552.1175 of the Government Code, we note that section 552.117 is the correct exception as the officer is still employed by the city. See Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(2), 552.1175; Open Records Decision No. 670 at 6 (2001) (authorizing all governmental bodies that are subject to chapter 552 of Government Code to withhold home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone numbers, personal pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers without necessity of requesting attorney general decision under Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2)); see also Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (delineating circumstances under which attorney general decision constitutes previous determination under Gov't Code § 552.301).

²The Act does not ordinarily require a governmental body to obtain information not in its possession or to prepare new information in response to a request. See *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 558 (1990), 499 (1988), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We will first address your responsibilities under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. Although you argue to withhold the "personal notes of the officers involved in this case (item 10)," the department did not submit to this office copies or representative samples of that specific information. Consequently, the department failed to comply with section 552.301(e) of the Government Code.

Because the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 with regard to the information at issue, this information is now presumed public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *see also* *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *City of Houston v. Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co.*, 673 S.W.2d 316, 323 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The department must demonstrate a compelling interest in order to overcome the presumption that the information at issue is now public. *See id.* Normally, a compelling interest is demonstrated when some other source of law makes the requested information confidential or when third party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Although the department claims that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code, we note that this exception to disclosure is a discretionary exception to disclosure under the Act that does not constitute a compelling interest that is sufficient to overcome the presumption that the information at issue is now public.³ Further, we note that, although the department claims that the information at issue is also excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code, the department in this instance has not demonstrated a compelling interest under this exception to disclosure that would allow any portion of the information at issue to be withheld from disclosure. *But see* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991) (need of another governmental body to withhold requested information may provide compelling reason for nondisclosure under section 552.108 in

³ Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege, section 552.107(1)), 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general); *see also* *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103).

certain circumstances). Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold the "personal notes of the officers involved in this case (item 10)" under either section 552.103 or section 552.108 of the Government Code. Consequently, the department must release this particular information to the requestor.

You claim that the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) that the information at issue is related to that litigation. See *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); see also Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *Id.*

The department represents to this office that the requested information relates to the arrest of the requestor's client who is the subject of a pending criminal prosecution. We understand you to assert that this criminal case was pending when the department received this request for information. The department does not inform us, however, that it is a party to the pending criminal litigation. See Gov't Code § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 575 at 2 (1990). Under such circumstances, we require an affirmative representation from the prosecuting attorney representing the governmental body that is a party to the litigation that he or she wants the submitted information withheld from disclosure under section 552.103. The department has submitted an affidavit from an Assistant County Attorney for Montgomery County in which the Assistant County Attorney states that her office is prosecuting the pending case. However, you have not included a representation from the

prosecuting attorney that the requested information be withheld from disclosure to protect the prosecutor's position in the pending litigation. Therefore, the department may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103.

We next address your arguments under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation 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[.]" A governmental body that raises section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990).

The department contends that the submitted information "relates to the pending investigation [because it] concerns the K-9 unit utilized by the [department] in the case against [the requestor's client]. . . . The results of the search [by the K-9 unit] led to the filing of the felony charge. . . ." Upon review of the submitted arguments and the information at issue, we determine that release of some of the submitted information "would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1); *see also 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. 434 at 3 (unless records show on their face that disclosure would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution, law enforcement agency must explain how release of particular records or parts thereof will do so). Thus, the department may withhold the information that we have marked based on section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. We note that the department has the discretion to release all or part of the marked information that is not otherwise confidential by law. Gov't Code § 552.007.

The department also raises section 552.108(b)(1), which excepts from disclosure "[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 . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution." Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in [a law enforcement agency], avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine [law enforcement] efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *City of Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has stated that under the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b), a governmental body may withhold information that would reveal law enforcement techniques or procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 456 (1987) (release of forms containing information regarding location of off-duty police officers in advance would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 413 (1984) (release of sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 409

(1984) (if information regarding certain burglaries exhibit pattern that reveals investigative techniques, information is excepted under predecessor to section 552.108), 341 (1982) (release of certain information from Department of Public Safety would unduly interfere with law enforcement because release would hamper departmental efforts to detect forgeries of drivers' licenses), 252 (1980) (predecessor to section 552.108 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). However, generally known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1). *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (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).

The department asserts that release of the submitted information would reveal investigative techniques and detailed procedures "which, if released, could jeopardize the lives and safety of police officer[s] and the general public. . . ." Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the release of portions of the submitted information would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may withhold the portions of the submitted information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, we have marked the information that the city may withhold under section 552.108. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/sdk

Ref: ID# 197008

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Stephen D. Jackson
Attorney at Law
318 North Main
Conroe, Texas 77301
(w/o enclosures)