



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 15, 2007

Mr. Joseph Harney
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi, Legal Department
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2007-07583

Dear Mr. Harney:

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 #281211.

The Corpus Christi Police Department (the "department") received one request for a specified police report and an accompanying video and one additional request for the same video. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides in pertinent part:

(b) An 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 is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). 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). To claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection, however, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force are not protected under section 552.108), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) exempts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement; the determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

In this instance, you inform us that certain identifying information in the police report pertains to undercover police officers. You argue that release of the officers’ identifying information “could jeopardize the anonymity of the undercover officers and place their lives at risk.” Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the release of the identifying information you have marked would interfere with law enforcement. You also argue that release of the submitted video, even with the officers’ faces blacked out or blurred, would interfere with the department’s undercover operations. You state that the video “depicts the operational tactics used by the [department] in these types of undercover operations,” and that release of the video would hinder the department’s future law enforcement efforts of a similar nature. Upon review of the video, we agree that its release would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may withhold the marked portions of the submitted reports, as well as the entire submitted video, under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure information that “relates to... a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state.” Gov’t Code § 552.130. In accordance with section 552.130 of the Government Code, the department must withhold the marked Texas-issued driver’s license number under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code provides that “[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from” required public disclosure under the Act. Gov’t Code § 552.147. Therefore, the department may withhold the marked social security number under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the officers’ identifying information in the submitted police report, as well as the entire submitted video, under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the Texas-issued driver’s license number under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Finally, the department may withhold the marked social security number under section 552.147 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Reg Hargrove", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJH/jb

Ref: ID# 281211

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Juan E. Rodriguez
Action 10 News, News Assignments Manager
301 Artesian
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Nick Nelson
Action 10 News
301 Artesian
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401
(w/o enclosures)