



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 20, 2006

Ms. Rebecca H. Brewer  
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Joplin P.C.  
Attorneys at Law  
P. O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2006-03963

Dear Ms. Brewer:

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# 247021.

The Frisco Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for all records related to a specific automobile collision, including any information pertaining to the arrest of a named individual in connection with the above referenced collision. You state that you have released the accident report, search warrant, and affidavit, but claim that the submitted 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 information.

Initially, you state that this office has previously addressed the public availability of the requested information. In Open Records Letter No. 2006-00057 (2006), we ruled that the requested information could be withheld under section 552.108 as information relating to a pending criminal investigation. However, we note that a small amount of information has been added to the submitted police report since we issued Open Records Letter No. 2006-00057. Therefore, the department may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2006-00057 as a previous determination with respect to most of the information at issue. 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 a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). We will address your arguments against

disclosure for the information added to the police report since we issued the prior ruling. *See id.* at 6. (for the first type of previous determination to apply, requested information must be precisely the same information as was addressed in a prior attorney general ruling).

Section 552.108(a) 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.” 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). You state that the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based upon this representation, we conclude that the release of the information at issue 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). Thus, the department may withhold the submitted information from disclosure based on section 552.108(a)(1). The department has the discretion to release all or part of the information that is not otherwise confidential by law. Gov’t Code § 552.007. As our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments.

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,



José Vela III  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JV/krl

Ref: ID# 247021

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Wendy Keith  
Legal Assistant  
Demarest, Smith, & Giunta, P.L.L.C.  
10440 N. Central Expressway, Suite 1100  
Dallas, Texas 75231  
(w/o enclosures)