



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 30, 2007

Mr. Mark G. Daniel
Law Offices of Evans, Gandy, Daniels & Moore
115 West Second Street, Suite 202
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2007-15801

Dear Mr. Daniel:

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# 296332.

The City of Watauga (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests for information pertaining to a specified motorcycle accident and the Watauga Police Department's (the "police department") policies on pursuits and blocking vehicles. You state that the city has no responsive information regarding a portion of the requests.¹ You further state that you have released some information to the requestors. However, you 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.

As a preliminary matter, we note that the submitted in-car video recordings have been previously addressed by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2007-14468 (2007). In this ruling, we held that the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information in the submitted recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, if the city lacks the technical capability to redact this information from the recordings, it must withhold the recordings in their entirety. We presume that the pertinent facts and circumstances have not changed since the issuance of this prior ruling. Thus, we determine that the city must continue to rely on this prior ruling with respect to the submitted in-car recordings. *See* Open

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist when the request for information was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

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).

The city argues that information pertaining to an internal investigation of the police department officers must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. We understand that the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 contemplates two different types of personnel files: a file that must be maintained by the city’s civil service director or the director’s designee, and another file that may be maintained by the city’s police department for its own use. Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(a), (g). In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer’s misconduct and takes disciplinary action against the police officer, section 143.089(a)(2) requires the police department to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer’s civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *Abbott v. City of Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.). All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or in possession of the police department because of its investigation into a police officer’s misconduct, and the police department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records are subject to release under chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, information maintained in a police department’s personnel file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You inform us that the information at issue pertains to a pending investigation that has not resulted in disciplinary action against any police department officer. Accordingly, we agree that the information pertaining to the internal investigations of police department officers is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and, thus, must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Next, the city argues that a portion of the remaining information may be withheld 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a). 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), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that a portion of the remaining information relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based upon this representation, we conclude that the release of the information you have marked would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of a 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).

We note, however, that basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.108. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d 177. *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information which you state has been released, the city may withhold the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

The city then seeks to withhold the requested policies pursuant to section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977)). 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.” *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To demonstrate the applicability of this exception, 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). This office has concluded that section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORD 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). You state that public

disclosure of the police department's policies regarding vehicle pursuit would interfere with law enforcement objectives and provide information detailing how individuals may evade a police officer. Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we find that release of portions of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b) of the Government Code. However, the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(b) to the remaining information at issue, and it may not be withheld on this basis.

In summary, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2007-14468 with respect to the submitted in-car recordings. The city must withhold the submitted information pertaining to the internal investigations of police department officers pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. With the exception of basic information which must be released, the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code may be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. Finally, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b) 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Chanita Chantaplin-McLelland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CC/jb

Ref: ID# 296332

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Jason B. Stephens
Stephens & Anderson, L.L.P.
4200 West Vickery Boulevard
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Melissa Vargas
Fort Worth Star-Telegram
400 West 7th
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(w/o enclosures)