



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 14, 2004

Ms. Susan Camp-Lee
Sheets & Crossfield, P.C.
309 East Main Street
Round Rock, Texas 78664-5246

OR2004-10590

Dear Ms. Camp-Lee:

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# 214856.

The Round Rock Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for a "[c]opy of department policy stating procedure to be followed regarding audio/video recording during traffic stops, subsequent investigation, detention and arrest of individuals, and recovery of evidence involved." You inform us that the department is releasing some information but claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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." This provision is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *City of Fort Worth v. Carnyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.).

To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). In addition, 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 law enforcement exception), 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 determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984) (construing statutory predecessor).

You contend that release of the information attached as Exhibit B would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution. You inform us that the information in policy number 4/2.08.01 consists of “[d]etailed information regarding booking and custody processing of prisoners.” You contend that the release of this information would “interfere with the investigation and prosecution of crime” in that it would provide prisoners with “information to escape custody, evade law enforcement personnel or gain access to weapons and cause harm to personnel.” Having considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted documents, we find that you have established that portions of the submitted information relate to detailed procedures the release of which would interfere with law enforcement. We have marked this information, which may be withheld pursuant to section 552.108(b)(1). However, we find that you have failed to explain how the remaining information at issue differs from procedures and techniques that are commonly known. Further, we find that you have made only conclusory allegations that release of this information would interfere with law enforcement and have thus failed to meet your burden of explaining how and why release of this information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* ORD 562 at 10. Thus, none of the remaining submitted information may be withheld pursuant to section 552.108(b)(1), and it 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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 214856

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kathryn E. Ryle
The Law Office of Richard J. Segura, Jr.
707 West 14th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)