



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 7, 2005

Ms. Linda Sjogren
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Angelo
P. O. Box 1751
San Angelo, Texas 76902

OR2005-01927

Dear Ms. Sjogren:

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# 219503.

The City of San Angelo (the "city") received a request for the videotape of a specified traffic stop. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.119, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision" and encompasses laws that make criminal history record information ("CHRI") confidential. CHRI "means information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions" but does not include "driving record information maintained by [the Department of Public Safety ("DPS")] under Subchapter C, Chapter 521, Transportation Code." Gov't Code § 411.082(2). CHRI obtained from the National Crime Information Center or the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law.

Federal regulations prohibit the release of CHRI maintained in state and local CHRI systems to the general public. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21(c)(1) ("Use of criminal history record information disseminated to noncriminal justice agencies shall be limited to the purpose for which it was given."), (2) ("No agency or individual shall confirm the existence or

nonexistence of criminal history record information to any person or agency that would not be eligible to receive the information itself.”). Under chapter 411 of the Government Code, a criminal justice agency may obtain CHRI from DPS or from another criminal justice agency. *Id.* §§ 411.083(b)(1), .087(a)(2), .089(a). However, CHRI so obtained is confidential and may only be disclosed in very limited instances. *See id.* § 411.084; *see also id.* § 411.087 (restrictions on disclosure of CHRI obtained from DPS also apply to CHRI obtained from other criminal justice agencies). Furthermore, when a law enforcement agency compiles information that depicts an individual as a criminal suspect, arrestee, or defendant, the compilation of information takes on a character that implicates the individual’s right to privacy in a manner that the same information in an uncompiled state does not. *See United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989); Open Records Decision No. 616 at 2-3 (1993).

However, section 411.081(b) allows a police department to disclose to the public CHRI “that is related to the offense for which a person is involved in the criminal justice system.” Gov’t Code § 411.081(b). Because the information at issue pertains to the person’s current involvement in the criminal justice system, we conclude that the city may not withhold the CHRI under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411 of the Government Code or under *Reporters Committee*.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.

....

(b) An 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 is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming 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(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977).

Section 552.108(b)(1) 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." *See City of Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App. Austin 2002, no writ). Under the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b), this office has stated that a governmental body may withhold certain information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *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 exhibits pattern that reveals investigative techniques, information is excepted under predecessor of 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). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *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 not protected), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a governmental body must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement; the determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

You assert that "release of the information would put criminals at an advantage in avoiding detection and would unduly interfere with law enforcement." However, upon review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude you have not demonstrated how release of the submitted video tape would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Therefore, you may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(b)(1).

You also raise section 552.119 of the Government Code as a possible exception to disclosure. This section provides:

- (a) A photograph that depicts a peace officer as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure, or a security officer commissioned under Section 51.212, Education Code, the release of which would endanger the life

or physical safety of the officer, is excepted from [required public disclosure] unless:

- (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.

(b) A photograph exempt from disclosure under Subsection (a) may be made public only if the peace officer or security officer gives written consent to the disclosure.

Gov't Code § 552.119. Under section 552.119, a governmental body must demonstrate, if the documents do not demonstrate on their face, that release of the photograph would endanger the life or physical safety of a peace officer.¹ Furthermore, a photograph of a peace officer cannot be withheld under section 552.119 if (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; (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding; or (4) the officer gives written consent to the disclosure. You state that the submitted videotape "depicts an undercover narcotics officer." You contend that release of the video images of this undercover officer "would endanger [his] life or safety." Having considered your representations and arguments, we find that you have established that release of the video images of an officer who has worked in an undercover capacity or is reasonably expected to work in such a capacity in the future would jeopardize that officer's safety. Therefore, to the extent that the video images depict an undercover officer, the likeness of this individual must be redacted from the submitted video tape in accordance with section 552.119.

Finally, you claim that the submitted video tape includes motor vehicle record information. Section 552.130 of the Government Code requires the city to withhold "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." Consequently, pursuant to section 552.130, the city must withhold portions of the video tape to the extent that they include Texas-issued driver's license and license plate information, including classes, restrictions, and expiration dates, as well as vehicle identification numbers that pertain to vehicles for which an agency of this state has issued a certificate of title or registration. We note, however, that section 552.130 is based on privacy concerns.

¹"Peace officer" is defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Therefore, the requestor has a special right of access to portions of the video tape that contain his own motor vehicle record information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect person's privacy interests).

The city asserts that it would be "extremely difficult to edit the videotape so as to release it or a portion of it in a manner that would not reveal the confidential information [contained in it] because the confidential information is inextricably intertwined with other information." We note that if the city lacks the technical capability to withhold these portions of the video tape, the video tape must be withheld in its entirety. *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983). If the city has the technical capability to withhold the section 552.119 information, and the section 552.130 information that does not relate to the requestor, then the city must only withhold these portions of the video tape and release the remaining information 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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/krl

Ref: ID# 219503

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Rebecca Duran
Mr. Ruben Duran
P. O. Box 125
Big Lake, Texas 76932
(w/o enclosures)