



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 17, 2014

Ms. Evelyn W. Kimeu
Staff Attorney
Houston Police Department
1200 Travis
Houston, Texas 77002-6000

OR2014-01157

Dear Ms. Kimeu:

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# 510046 (ORU No. 13-6231).

The Houston Police Department (the "department") received a request for four categories of information related to a specified incident. You state you will release some of the requested information. You state you have no information responsive to portions of the request.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state some of the submitted information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2013-15353 (2013). In that ruling, we determined, in part, the department must withhold certain information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.1214 of the Local Government Code and, with the exception of basic information, may withhold certain information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Government Code. You assert there has been no change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and 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).

We note, however, the requestor asserts a right of access to the submitted information under federal law. In this instance, the requestor is a representative of Disability Rights Texas (“DRTX”), formerly known as Advocacy, Inc., which has been designated as the state’s protection and advocacy system (“P&A system”) for purposes of the federal Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (“PAIMI Act”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 10801-10851, the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (“DDA Act”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 15041-15045, and the Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights Act (“PAIR Act”), 29 U.S.C. § 794e. *See* Tex. Gov. Exec. Order No. DB-33, 2 Tex. Reg. 3713 (1977); Attorney General Opinion JC-0461 (2002); *see also* 42 C.F.R. §§ 51.2 (defining “designated official” and requiring official to designate agency to be accountable for funds of P&A agency), .22 (requiring P&A agency to have a governing authority responsible for control).

The PAIMI provides, in relevant part, DRTX, as the state’s P&A system, shall

(1) have the authority to—

(A) investigate incidents of abuse and neglect of individuals with mental illness if the incidents are reported to the [P&A] system or if there is probable cause to believe that the incidents occurred[.]

42 U.S.C. § 10805(a)(1)(A). Further, the PAIMI provides DRTX shall

(4) . . . have access to all records of—

(B) any individual (including an individual who has died or whose whereabouts are unknown)-

(i) who by reason of the mental or physical condition of such individual is unable to authorize the [P&A] system to have such access;

(ii) who does not have a legal guardian, conservator, or other legal representative, or for whom the legal guardian is the State; and

(iii) with respect to whom a complaint has been received by the [P&A] system or with respect to whom as a result of monitoring or other activities (either of which result from a complaint or other evidence) there is probable cause to believe that such individual has been subject to abuse or neglect[.]

Id. § 10805(a)(4)(B). The term “records” as used in the above-quoted provision

includes reports prepared by any staff of a facility rendering care and treatment [to the individual] or reports prepared by an agency charged with investigating reports of incidents of abuse, neglect, and injury occurring at such facility that describe incidents of abuse, neglect, and injury occurring at such facility and the steps taken to investigate such incidents, and discharge planning records.

Id. § 10806(b)(3)(A); *see also* 42 C.F.R. § 51.41(c) (addressing P&A system’s access to records under PAIMI). Further, PAIMI defines the term “facilities” and states the term “may include, but need not be limited to, hospitals, nursing homes, community facilities for individuals with mental illness, board and care homes, homeless shelters, and jails and prisons.” 42 U.S.C. § 10802(3). The DDA Act provides, in relevant part, that a P&A system shall

(B) have the authority to investigate incidents of abuse and neglect of individuals with developmental disabilities if the incidents are reported to the system or if there is probable cause to believe that the incidents occurred;

...

(I) have access to all records of—

(ii) any individual with a developmental disability, in a situation in which—

(I) the individual, by reason of such individual’s mental or physical condition, is unable to authorize the system to have such access;

(II) the individual does not have a legal guardian, conservator, or other legal representative, or the legal guardian of the individual is the State; and

(III) a complaint has been received by the system about the individual with regard to the status or treatment of the individual or, as a result of monitoring or other activities, there is probable cause to believe that such individual has been subject to abuse or neglect[.]

...

(J)(i) have access to the records of individuals described in subparagraphs (B) and (I), and other records that are relevant to conducting an investigation, under the circumstances described in those subparagraphs, not later than 3 business days after the [P&A] system makes a written request for the records involved[.]

Id. § 15043(a)(2)(B), (I)(ii), (J)(i). The DDA Act states the term “record” includes

(1) a report prepared or received by any staff at any location at which services, supports, or other assistance is provided to individuals with developmental disabilities;

(2) a report prepared by an agency or staff person charged with investigating reports of incidents of abuse or neglect, injury, or death occurring at such location, that describes such incidents and the steps taken to investigate such incidents; and

(3) a discharge planning record.

Id. § 15043(c). The PAIR Act provides, in relevant part, a P&A system will “have the same . . . access to records and program income, as are set forth in [the DDA Act].” 29 U.S.C. § 794e(f)(2).

The requestor states the deceased individual suffered from a mental and physical disability and DRTX received information this individual was shot and killed by a department officer while residing in a board and care home. DRTX explains the department was charged with investigating the incident at issue. DRTX also informs us it intends to investigate this death for possible incidents of abuse or neglect of an individual with a mental disability as governed by the PAIMI. DRTX asserts the individual at issue does not have a legal guardian, conservator, or other legal representative acting on his behalf with regard to the investigation of possible abuse and neglect and his death. Additionally, DRTX states it has probable cause to believe the individual’s death may have been the result of abuse and neglect. *See* 42 C.F.R. § 51.2 (stating that the probable cause decision under PAIMI may be based on reasonable inference drawn from one’s experience or training regarding similar incidents, conditions or problems that are usually associated with abuse or neglect).

We note a state statute is preempted by federal law to the extent it conflicts with that federal law. *See, e.g., Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995). Further, federal regulations provide that state law must not diminish the required authority of a P&A system. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 1386.21(f); *see also Iowa Prot. & Advocacy Servs., Inc. v. Gerard*, 274 F. Supp. 2d 1063 (N.D. Iowa 2003) (broad right of access under section 15043 of title 42 of the United States Code applies despite existence of any state or local laws or regulations which attempt to restrict access; although state law may expand authority of P&A system, state law cannot diminish authority set forth in federal statutes); *Iowa Prot. & Advocacy Servs., Inc. v. Rasmussen*, 206 F.R.D. 630, 639 (S.D. Iowa 2001); *cf.* 42 U.S.C. § 10806(b)(2)(C). Similarly, Texas law states, “[n]otwithstanding other state law, [a P&A system] . . . is entitled to access to records relating to persons with mental illness to the extent authorized by federal law.” Health & Safety Code § 615.002(a). Thus, the PAIMI Act and the DDA Act grant DRTX access to “records,” and, to the extent state law provides for the confidentiality of “records” requested by DRTX, its federal rights of access under the PAIMI Act and the DDA Act preempt state law. *See* 42 C.F.R. § 51.41(c); *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n*, 905 F. Supp. at 382. Accordingly, we must address whether the information at issue constitutes “records” of an individual with a mental illness as defined by the PAIMI Act or a disability as defined by the DDA Act.

Although the definition of “records” is not limited to the information specifically described in sections 10806(b)(3)(A) and 15043(c) of title 42 of the United States Code, we do not believe Congress intended for the definitions to be so expansive as to grant a P&A system access to any information it deems necessary.² Such a reading of the statute would render sections 10806(b)(3)(A) and 15043(c) insignificant. *See Duncan v. Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 174 (2001) (statute should be construed in a way that no clause, sentence, or word shall be superfluous, void, or insignificant). Furthermore, in light of Congress’s evident preference for limiting the scope of access, we are unwilling to assume that Congress meant more than it said in enacting the PAIMI Act and the DDA Act. *See Kofa v. INS*, 60 F.3d 1084 (4th Cir. 1995) (stating that statutory construction must begin with language of statute; to do otherwise would assume that Congress does not express its intent in words of statutes, but only by way of legislative history). *See generally Coast Alliance v. Babbitt*, 6 F. Supp. 2d 29 (D.D.C. 1998) (stating that if, in following Congress’s plain language in statute, agency cannot carry out Congress’s intent, remedy is not to distort or ignore Congress’s words, but rather to ask Congress to address problem). Based on this analysis, we believe the information specifically described in sections 10806(b)(3)(A) and 15043(c) is indicative of the types of information to which Congress intended to grant a P&A system access. *See Penn. Prot. & Advocacy, Inc. v. Houstoun*, 228 F.3d 423, 426 n.1 (3rd Cir. 2000)

²Use of the term “includes” in section 10806(b)(3)(A) of title 42 of the United States Code indicates the definition of “records” is not limited to the information specifically listed in that section. *See St. Paul Mercury Ins. Co. v. Lexington Ins. Co.*, 78 F.3d 202 (5th Cir. 1996); *see also* 42 C.F.R. § 51.41.

("[I]t is clear that the definition of 'records' in § 10806 controls the types of records to which [the P&A system] 'shall have access' under § 10805[.]").

We note some of the information at issue in Open Records Letter No. 2013-15353 relates to the department's administrative investigation into the named individual's death. Based on the requestor's representations, we determine DRTX has a right of access to this information, which we have marked, pursuant to subsections (a)(1)(A) and (a)(4)(B) of section 10805 of title 42 of the United States Code and subsections (a)(2)(B), (I)(ii), and (J)(i) of section 15043 of title 42 of the United States Code. Thus, we find the circumstances of the prior ruling have changed with respect to the information we have marked and the department may not continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2013-15353 as a previous determination for this information. As DRTX has a right of access to this administrative investigation information, the department must release it to this requestor. The information you have submitted as Exhibit 4 was also at issue in the prior ruling. It consists of the criminal investigation into the incident that was created for law enforcement purposes. We note this information is not among the information specifically listed as "records" in sections 10806(b)(3)(A) and 15043(c). Furthermore, we find this information is not the type of information to which Congress intended to grant a P&A system access. Accordingly, we find DRTX does not have a right of access to the criminal investigation information in Exhibit 4 under either the PAIMI Act or the DDA Act. We therefore agree the circumstances of the prior ruling have not changed with respect to this information and the department may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2013-15353 as a previous determination for this information.

We now address your argument for the remaining submitted information that was not at issue in the prior ruling. Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n 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 . . . if . . . 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.). 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) (construing statutory predecessor). This office has concluded 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 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.*, ORDs 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). 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).

You state the information in Exhibit 2 consists of internal policies and procedures that relate to the use of conducted energy devices by department officers. You assert release of the information you have marked could allow a suspect to gain a tactical edge over a police officer and expose the officer and members of the public to substantial danger. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the department may withhold the information you have marked in Exhibit 2 under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

The requestor also asserts she has a right of access to the remaining information at issue in Exhibit 2 pursuant to the PAIMI Act and the DDA Act. As noted above, the PAIMI Act and the DDA Act grant DRTX access to "records," and, to the extent state law provides for the confidentiality of "records" requested by DRTX, its federal rights of access under the PAIMI Act and the DDA Act preempt state law. We note the remaining information at issue consists of internal policies and procedures of the department, which is not among the information specifically listed as "records" in sections 10806(b)(3)A) and 15043(c). Further, we find the information at issue is not the type of information to which Congress intended to grant a P&A system access. Thus, we conclude DRTX has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 10806 of title 42 of the United States Code or section 15043 of title 42 of the United States Code to this information. Accordingly, DRTX does not have a right of access to the internal policies and procedures you have marked.

In summary, the department may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2013-15353 as a previous determination with respect to the information in Exhibit 4 and withhold or release the identical information in Exhibit 4 in accordance with that ruling. The department may withhold the information you have marked in Exhibit 2 under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. A. Ybarra". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "N" and a stylized "Ybarra".

Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/ac

Ref: ID# 510046

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)