



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 27, 2006

Mr. David L. Hay
Dallas County Community College District
R. L. Thornton Jr. Bldg.
701 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75202-3299

OR2006-00925

Dear Mr. Hay:

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# 241001.

The Dallas County Community College District (the "district") received a request for four specified incident reports. You state that you will release some responsive information. You claim, however, that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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 . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how

¹We 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.

and why section 552.108 is applicable to that information. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex.1977); Open Records Decision No.434 at 2-3 (1986). You state that the information at issue pertains to a pending criminal investigation being conducted by the district's police department (the "department"). Thus, we agree that the information you have highlighted in Exhibits D, E, F, and G may generally be withheld from the requestor under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code 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." 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." *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded that this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department's use of force policy), 508 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution), 211 (1978) (information relating to undercover narcotics investigations), 143 (1977) (log revealing use of electronic eavesdropping equipment).

You inform us that the requested information consists of criminal history checks made via TLETS. You explain that the TLETS logs are created and maintained by the department for purposes of monitoring use of the system and assuring that unauthorized individuals do not have access to confidential information. You assert that release of TLETS logs "could easily give a criminal sufficient warning to evade detection and/or prosecution." You state that "a records check might be run well before the individual has ever been contacted by [the department]," and contend that "an individual who can find out whether any law enforcement agency has run checks on him/her . . . can obviously gain valuable knowledge in terms of concealing his/her activities from law enforcement scrutiny." Thus, you assert that release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement activities. Based on your arguments and the information you provided, we agree that release of the information in Exhibit H would interfere with law enforcement. We therefore conclude that the information in Exhibit H may be withheld in its entirety under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

However, section 552.108 is inapplicable to 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 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). Thus, the type of information considered to be basic front page

offense and arrest report information generally must be released, even if this information is not actually located on the front page of the offense report. Basic front page offense and arrest report information includes the identity and description of the complainant. *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 4 (1976) (summarizing types of information made public by Houston Chronicle). In this instance, however, you assert that the identity of the complainants is protected by the informer's privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Texas courts have recognized the informer's privilege. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). It protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1- 2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (*citing* Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988). You indicate, and the submitted documents show, that the complainant at issue reported to a district campus peace officer the alleged crime of criminal trespass. You inform us that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Having considered your representations and reviewed the submitted information, we agree that, pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common law informer's privilege, the district may withhold the complainant's identifying information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 279 at 2 (1981), 156 (1977) (granting informer's privilege for the identity of an individual who reported to a city animal control division a possible violation of a statute that carried with it criminal penalties).

Finally, we note that Exhibit I contains a driver's license. Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

(1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]

(2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Gov't Code § 552.130. You must withhold the highlighted Texas driver's license in Exhibit I under section 552.130.

In summary, the district may withhold the complainant's identifying information pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common law informer's privilege. With the exception of basic information, you may withhold the information you have highlighted in Exhibits D, E, F, and G under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. You may withhold Exhibit H in its entirety under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. You must withhold the driver's license in Exhibit I under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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); *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,



Brian J. Rogers
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BJR/krl

Ref: ID# 241001

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Linda Patterson
4501 Bobtown Rd. Apt. #A-106
Garland, Texas 75043
(w/o enclosures)