



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 7, 2008

Ms. Zindia Thomas
Assistant Attorney General
Public Information Coordinator
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2008-06261

Dear Ms. Thomas:

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# 309442.

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received a request for documents related to training courses for investigating the online solicitation of minors and the names of these courses. The OAG asserts the information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered and reviewed the submitted arguments and representative sample of documents.¹

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

- (a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

...

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.

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(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:

...

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). Because the requested records are internal records rather than records involving a particular criminal matter, section 552.108(b)(3) is the apposite exception in this instance, not section 552.108(a)(4).

In *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379 (Tex. 1994), the Texas Supreme Court held that a request for a district attorney's "entire litigation file" was "too broad" and held that "the decision as to what to include in [the file], necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case." *Id* at 380. (quoting *Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458 (Tex. 1993)). Accordingly, the court concluded that in such an instance, the district attorney's entire litigation file is privileged attorney work product. Here, the OAG states the request asked for "the OAG's entire law enforcement training concerning online solicitation of minors." We agree; the request is for training materials, not any litigation files. Thus, the *Curry* analysis is inapplicable and the OAG may not withhold the information under section 552.108(b)(3) in conjunction with *Curry*.

Section 552.108(b) provides in relevant 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 the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

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

Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). This office has stated that under the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1), a governmental body may withhold information that would reveal law enforcement techniques or procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 409 (1984) (if information regarding certain burglaries exhibit a pattern that reveals investigative techniques, information is excepted under predecessor to section 552.108), 341 (1982) (release of certain information from Department of Public Safety would unduly interfere with law enforcement because release would hamper departmental efforts to detect forgeries of drivers' licenses), 252 (1980) (predecessor to 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). However, generally 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 predecessor to section 552.108), 252 at 3 (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

The OAG asserts release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention because it details how the OAG conducts its criminal investigations and prosecutions of the online solicitation of minors. After review of the information, we agree the OAG may withhold the slides it marked under section 552.108(b)(1). However, the remaining information either reveals commonly known investigative procedures and techniques or the OAG has not sufficiently explained how release of the information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Therefore, the OAG must release the information it did not mark.

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,



Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/sdk

Ref: ID# 309442

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kimberly J. Samman
Smith and Hassler
1445 North Loop West, Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77008
(w/o enclosures)