



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 28, 2005

Ms. J. Middlebrooks  
Assistant City Attorney  
Criminal Law and Police Section  
Dallas Police Department  
1400 South Lamar  
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2005-08787

Dear Ms. Middlebrooks:

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# 233095.

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for "[a]ll complaints filed by employees of the Acapulco Spa to the Internal Affairs Division concerning alleged misconduct by Dallas police officers[.]" You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup> We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (allowing interested party to submit comments indicating why requested information should or should not be released).

As a preliminary matter, you state that the present request seeks the same information that was the subject of a prior ruling issued by this office as Open Records Letter No. 2005-08197 (2005). With regard to the submitted information that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2005-08197,

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach and, therefore, does not authorize the withholding of any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

we conclude that, as we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed, you may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2005-08197 as a previous determination. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent that the submitted information was not the subject of Open Records Letter No. 2005-08197, we will address the submitted arguments.

We note that the submitted video recording appears to have been obtained pursuant to a grand jury subpoena. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined that a grand jury, for purposes of the Act, is a part of the judiciary, and therefore not subject to the Act. Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). When an individual or entity acts at the direction of the grand jury as its agent, information prepared or collected by the agent is within the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to chapter 552. Open Records Decision No. 513 at 3 (1988). Thus, to the extent that the submitted video recording was obtained pursuant to a grand jury subpoena and is held by the department as agent of the grand jury, it consists of records of the judiciary not subject to disclosure under the Act. To the extent the submitted video recording does not consist of records of the judiciary, we will address the submitted arguments.

We further note that the submitted information includes an arrest warrant. Article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that “[t]he arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, is public information[.]” Crim. Proc. Code art. 15.26. The exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not apply to information that is made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Accordingly, the marked arrest warrant must be released pursuant to article 15.26.

We now turn to your arguments regarding the submitted information. Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(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). In this instance, you explain that the submitted information pertains to an ongoing criminal investigation by the department's Public Integrity Unit. Based upon this representation, we conclude that release of the submitted information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See 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). *But see Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S. W. 2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution).

However, section 552.108 does not except basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). We believe such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (listing basic information that must be released from offense report in accordance with *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the department may withhold the submitted information based on section 552.108. We note that you have the discretion to release all or part of the information at issue that is not otherwise confidential by law. Gov't Code § 552.007.

In summary, to the extent that the present request seeks records that were at issue in Open Records Letter No. 2005-08197, the department may continue to rely on that ruling as a previous determination. To the extent that the department has custody of the submitted video recording as an agent of the grand jury, it is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to disclosure under the Act. The marked arrest warrant must be released pursuant to article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Except for basic information, the remaining information may be withheld pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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); *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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Caroline E. Cho  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 233095

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Bob Gorsky  
Lyon, Gorsky, Baskett, Haring, Gilbert & Cates  
2501 Cedar Springs Road, Suite 750  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(w/o enclosures)