



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 27, 2004

Mr. John Patterson  
Assistant City Attorney  
Legal Services Department  
City of Waco  
P.O. Box 2570  
Waco, Texas 76702

OR2004-9179

Dear Mr. Patterson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 211682.

The Waco Police Department (the “department”) received a request for a report pertaining to a stolen vehicle. You state that you have provided the requestor with some of the requested information. You claim, however, that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

First, you claim that the records of communication transactions between the department and the Texas Criminal Information Center (“TCIC”) are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(b)(1) 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: (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). 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 writ).

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 a pattern that reveals investigative techniques, information is excepted under 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) (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).

To claim this exception, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Generally known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (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). Whether disclosure of particular records will interfere with law enforcement or prosecution must be decided on a case-by-case basis. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-381 (1981).

You assert that "release of the [communications between the department and the TCIC] could reveal when law enforcement is tracking certain vehicles as being suspected stolen vehicles" and "suspects [who obtain] this kind of information would have a distinct advantage in efforts of avoiding detection and apprehension by law enforcement." Thus, you contend that release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement activities.

Upon review of your arguments and the submitted information, we find you have failed to establish that release of the information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); Open Records Decision No. 508 at 4 (1988) (governmental body must demonstrate how release of particular information at issue would interfere with law enforcement efforts unless information does so on its face). We therefore determine the department may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.108(b)(1).

Second, you claim that some of the information in the submitted police report is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information that “relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state.” Gov’t Code § 552.130. We note that the TCIC communications also contain information that is subject to section 152.130. Section 552.130 excepts information from disclosure in order to protect individuals’ privacy. Therefore, the requestor is entitled to information pertaining to his own motor vehicle, and such information may not be withheld from the requestor under section 552.130.<sup>1</sup> See Gov’t Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to information to person to whom information relates on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). In summary, the submitted information must be released in its entirety 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,

---

<sup>1</sup>Because the documents being released contain information relating to the requestor that would be excepted from disclosure to the general public to protect his privacy, the department must request another ruling from our office if it receives a future request for this information from an individual other than the requestor or his authorized representative.


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,



Tamara L. Harswick  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TLH/sdk

Ref: ID# 211682

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Stephen Romero  
624 North 20<sup>th</sup>  
Waco, Texas 76707  
(w/o enclosures)