



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 1, 2016

Ms. Cynthia Trevino  
Counsel for the City of Rosenberg  
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal Hyde & Zech, P.C.  
2500 West William Cannon, Suite 609  
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2016-04933

Dear Ms. Trevino:

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# 600023.

The City of Rosenberg (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails sent or received by four named individuals pertaining to specified allegations against a named city employee.<sup>1</sup> You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note portions of the submitted information are not responsive to the instant request because they were created after the date the request was received. The city need not

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the city received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *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).

release nonresponsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code exempts 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). Some of the submitted information pertains to an internal affairs investigation conducted by the Fort Bend County Sheriff’s Office on behalf of the city’s police department. Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to information relating to an administrative investigation that did not involve a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. 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 City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 329 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (section 552.108 generally not applicable to law enforcement agency’s personnel records); Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). However, you explain the internal affairs investigation is related to a pending criminal prosecution being conducted by the Fort Bend County District Attorney’s Office (the “district attorney’s office”). You also state the district attorney’s office objects to release of the responsive information because its release would interfere with the pending criminal prosecution. Based upon this representation and our review, we find 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) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, we find the city may withhold the responsive 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

---

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

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 "JBW" with a large flourish extending to the right.

Joseph Behnke  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/akg

Ref: ID# 600023

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)