



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 7, 2016

Ms. Stephanie Berry
Assistant City Attorney
City of Denton
215 East McKinney
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2016-07808

Dear Ms. Berry:

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# 604793.

The Denton Police Department (the "department") received a request for multiple categories of information pertaining to a specified incident and specified department policies. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the department seeks to withdraw its request for an open records decision because it asserts the request for information was withdrawn by operation of law when the requestor failed to timely respond to a cost estimate for providing the requested records. Upon review of a copy of the cost estimate, we find it does not comply with the requirements of section 552.2615(a) of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.2615(a). Accordingly, we conclude the request for information was not withdrawn by operation of law. *See id.* § 552.2615(b).

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or

¹We note although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this exception applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

prosecution of crime . . . if . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You assert Exhibit B pertains to a closed case that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to Exhibit B.

We note, however, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing the types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes, among other items, the identity and description of the complainant. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the department may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2).²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by the common-law informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law* § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5. The privilege excepts the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer’s identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

You state some of the basic information identifies a complainant who reported a possible criminal violation to the department. There is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989). 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." *See City of Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (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). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 is 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). However, section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable 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). You state releasing the submitted information would reveal specific procedures and techniques used by officers involved in apprehending subjects, unduly interfere with law enforcement, and jeopardize officer safety. Upon review, we find the release of the information we marked would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. However, the department has failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, the department may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2). In releasing basic information from Exhibit B, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The

department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.

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,



Joseph Keeney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JDK/dls

Ref: ID# 604793

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)