



February 27, 2015

Mr. Daniel Ortiz  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of El Paso  
P.O. Box 1890  
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2015-03987

Dear Mr. Ortiz:

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# 556103 (El Paso Ref. No. 14-1026-5004).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for a specified internal affairs investigation. You state you have released the majority of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992,

writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). However, you inform us the information at issue relates to pending criminal investigations. Based upon this representation and our review, we find the city has demonstrated release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976).

However, as you acknowledge, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

We understand you to assert the basic information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate how any of the basic information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

---

<sup>1</sup>As we reach this conclusion, we do not address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code except to note that, generally, basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.101 excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101.

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](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 "J. Behnke", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Joseph Behnke  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 556103

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)