



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 20, 2004

Mr. James L. Dougherty, Jr.
Attorney at Law
5120 Bayard
Houston, Texas 77006

OR2004-8010

Dear Mr. Dougherty:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 212185.

The West University Place Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to case number 04P0566 and policies and procedures regarding search and seizure. You state that you have provided the requestor with all but the videotape. The department claims the depictions of the police officers on the videotape are excepted from disclosure under section 552.119 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.119 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure a photograph of a peace officer that, if released, would endanger the life or physical safety of the officer unless one of three exceptions applies. Gov't Code §552.119. The three exceptions are: (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information; (2) the officer is a party in a fire or police civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; or (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding. This section also provides that a photograph exempt from disclosure under this section may be made public only if the peace officer gives written consent to the disclosure. In this instance, the department has not demonstrated, nor is it apparent from our review of the submitted information, that release of the images of the police officers would endanger the life or physical safety of the officers. We therefore determine that the department must release the videotape because it has not shown the applicability of section 552.119 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 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yen-Ha Le', written in a cursive style.

Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/sdk

Ref: ID# 212185

Enc. Submitted videotape

c: Ms. Emily Kelly
7600 Burgoyne #244
Houston, Texas 77063
(w/o enclosures)