ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 26, 2006

Ms. J. Middlebrooks
City of Dallas
Criminal Law and Police Division
1400 South Lamar
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2006-08111

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# 254750.

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for five categories of information regarding two named police officers. You claim that the requested information is 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]

Initially, we note that you have only submitted information related to the department's internal affairs and public integrity records for our review. To the extent any additional responsive information existed on the date the department received this request, we assume you have released it to the requestor. If you have not released any such information, you must release it at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records

[1]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.

Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, you state that the present request seeks information which was the subject of a prior ruling issued by this office as Open Records Letter No. (2006-07922) (2006). 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.2006-07922, 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. 2006-07922 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. 2006-07922, we will address the submitted arguments.

You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(a) of the Government Code. 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). However, section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal investigation that is purely administrative in nature. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). You state that the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation by the department's Public Integrity Section. Based upon this representation, we conclude that the release of this 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).

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 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.*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Basic information includes the identification and description of the complainant. Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). You claim,

however, that some of the basic information is confidential and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). This office has found that information tending to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense is protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). Thus, the department must withhold the complainant's identifying information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the complainant's identifying information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.[2]

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

---

[2]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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/ir

Ref: ID# 254750

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tanya Eiserer
Dallas Morning News
508 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)