



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 27, 2016

Ms. Akilah Mance
Counsel for the City of Stafford
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2016-09492

Dear Ms. Mance:

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# 607684 (Ref. No. COS16-019).

The City of Stafford (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information relating to complaints to and policies created by the city's police department (the "department") regarding a specified offense during a specified time period. You state the city has released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(b) 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 (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). This section 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." *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded this provision protects certain kinds of information, the

disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 3-4 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department's use of force policy), 508 at 3-4 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution). However, to claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (former section 552.108 does not protect Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques submitted were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

The city states the submitted information contains detailed insight into the department's policy and guidelines. The city asserts the release of the submitted information "has the potential for interfering with law enforcement objectives in that it may equip the public, and particularly criminals, with guidance as to the type of conduct that an officer must tolerate before he may exercise the use of force, and have the effect of encouraging these individuals to tailor their behavior accordingly." Thus, the city asserts the submitted information would unduly interfere with law enforcement. However, upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the release of any portion of the submitted information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. As the city does not raise another exception to disclosure, the city must release the submitted 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lee Seidlits", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/bw

Ref: ID# 607684

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)