



February 27, 2015

Mr. Evaristo Garcia, Jr.
Assistant City Attorney
City of McAllen
P.O. Box 220
McAllen, Texas 78505-0220

OR2015-03979

Dear Mr. Garcia:

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# 554950.

The McAllen Police Department (the "department") received a request for e-mails to or from department officers ranked captain or higher, containing ten specified words, during a specified period of time.¹ You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.152 of the Government Code. We have

¹We note the department sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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); see *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d at 327 (Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) protected information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed use of force guidelines), 456 (1987) (information regarding location of off-duty police officers), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

The department explains the e-mails at issue “reflect policy decisions by joint law enforcement agencies and [the e-mails] will assist the department and how it will access and evaluate threats and risks to and vulnerabilities of public safety[.]” The department states revealing the requested information would “place an individual at an advantage in confrontations with police officers and would increase the chances of evading arrest or detection by virtue of that knowledge and jeopardize and place a substantial risk of injury for the officer and general public.” Upon review, we find the department has demonstrated release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the department may withhold the requested information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.³

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.

²We 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.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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,



Rustam Abedinzadeh
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RA/dls

Ref: ID# 554950

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)