



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 7, 2006

Mr. David K. Walker
County Attorney
Montgomery County
207 West Phillips, 1st Floor
Conroe, Texas 77301

OR2006-05977

Dear Mr. Walker:

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# 250957.

The Montgomery County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff") received two requests for information pertaining to a named individual and a specified incident. You claim that 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 representative sample of information.¹

You inform us that some of the requested information is subject to a previous ruling from this office. In Open Records Letter Ruling 2006-00644 (2006), this office determined that some of the submitted information was excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. We note that relevant facts and circumstances have changed since the issuance of our previous ruling. In the previous request, the sheriff asserted that release of the submitted information would interfere with the detection,

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.

investigation, or prosecution of crime because it pertained to a pending criminal investigation. However, you inform us that the investigation has now concluded. Therefore, as relevant facts have changed since the issuance of Open Records Letter Ruling 2006-00644, we conclude that the sheriff may not rely on that ruling as a previous determination. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on previous determination when the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D); the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling). Accordingly, we will address the applicability of the exception you claim.

We next note, however, that the submitted information contains a search warrant affidavit. The release of a search warrant affidavit is governed by article 18.01 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides in part:

(b) No search warrant shall issue for any purpose in this state unless sufficient facts are first presented to satisfy the issuing magistrate that probable cause does in fact exist for its issuance. A sworn affidavit setting forth substantial facts establishing probable cause shall be filed in every instance in which a search warrant is requested. The affidavit is public information if executed, and the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the affidavit available for public inspection in the clerk's office during normal business hours.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 18.01(b). This provision makes the search warrant affidavit expressly public if the search warrant has been executed. The submitted documents indicate that the search warrant at issue was executed. The exceptions found in the Act do not, as a general rule, apply to information that is made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Decision No. 525 (1989) (statutory predecessor). Therefore, pursuant to article 18.01(b), the sheriff must release the submitted search warrant affidavit.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning a criminal investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. You state that the requested information pertains to a case that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Therefore, we agree that section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing 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, with the exception of the basic front page offense and arrest information, you may withhold the requested information from disclosure based on section 552.108(a)(2). We note that you have the discretion to release all or part of the remaining information that is not otherwise confidential by law. *Id.* § 552.007.

In summary, the sheriff must release the submitted search warrant affidavit under article 18.01(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Other than basic information, which must be released, the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/sdk

Ref: ID# 250957

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Lanny D. Ray
Cantrell, Ray, Maltzberger & Barcus, L.L.P.
1204 Sam Houston Avenue, Suite 8
Huntsville, Texas 77340
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. L. Christine Lawrence
Life Benefits Specialist, AD & D
Unun Life Insurance Company of America
P.O. Box 100158
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-3158
(w/o enclosures)