



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 11, 2013

Ms. Rebecca Estrada Quinn
Assistant County Attorney
El Paso County Attorney's Office
County Courthouse, Room 503
500 East San Antonio
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2013-04088

Dear Ms. Quinn:

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# 484816 (OP-13-043).

The El Paso Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for photographs pertaining to a specified incident. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the sheriff's office's procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), within ten business days after receiving the request the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). In this instance, you state the sheriff's office received the request for information on January 29, 2013. Accordingly, the ten-business-day deadline was February 12, 2013. The sheriff's office's request for a decision, however, bears a meter mark reflecting it was mailed on February 13, 2013. *See id.* § 552.308(a) (deadline under the Act is met if document bears post office mark indicating time within the deadline period). Consequently, we find the sheriff's office failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions that protect only a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). However, the interests under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of a governmental body other than the one that failed to comply with section 552.301 can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 at 2-3 (1991), 469 (1987) (university may withhold information under predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103 to protect district attorney's interest in anticipated criminal litigation). In this instance, the 34th Judicial District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") asserts an interest in the information at issue. Accordingly, we will consider whether the sheriff's office may withhold the information at issue on behalf of the district attorney's office.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body must reasonably explain how release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You have provide an affidavit from the district attorney's office stating the submitted information pertains to a pending criminal case. Based on this representation and our review of the information, we conclude release of the information at issue 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) (court describes law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, the sheriff's office may withhold the submitted

information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.¹

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/bhf

Ref: ID# 484816

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure.