



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 1, 2015

Mr. Rodolfo "Rudy" Santos, Jr.  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Laredo  
P.O. Box 579  
Laredo, Texas 78042-0579

OR2015-10619

Dear Mr. Santos:

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# 565452 (Reference Nos. W004724-031015 and W004725-031015).

The City of Laredo (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for (1) the video footage related to two specified police reports, (2) all "motorcycle GPS's" from the city's police department (the "department") during a specified period of time, (3) the names of two specified officers, and (4) the names of police officers who are allowed to take home department motorcycles. You state you do not have information responsive to category two above.<sup>1</sup> You state you have already released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city'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(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S. W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.— San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). In this instance, you state the city received the requests for information on March 10, 2015. You do not inform us the city was closed for any business days between March 10, 2015, and March 31, 2015. Accordingly, the fifteen-business-day deadline was March 31, 2015. However, the city submitted a copy of the requests as required under subsection 552.301(e) in an envelope meter-marked April 9, 2015. *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 city 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 the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released, unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See 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 of the Government Code); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason may exist to withhold information when the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third-party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Section 552.108 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body’s interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the city may not withhold the requested information based on its own law enforcement interest. However, the need of a governmental body other than the agency that is seeking an open records decision to withhold information under section 552.108 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to withhold information from disclosure. *See* ORD 586 at 3. Because you inform us the Webb County District Attorney’s Office (the “district attorney’s office”) objects to the release of the information at issue, we will consider whether the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 on behalf of the district attorney’s office. Further, because section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of section 552.101 to 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(a)(1) 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). You state the district attorney's office objects to release of the submitted information because release would interfere with the district attorney's pending criminal investigation and prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude release of the information at issue will 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). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the submitted information. Therefore, you may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.<sup>2</sup>

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,



Katelyn Blackburn-Rader  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KB-R/akg

Ref: ID# 565452

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.