



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 8, 2016

Mr. Benjamin L. Stool  
Counsel for the City of Grapevine  
Boyle & Lowry, L.L.P.  
4201 Wingren Drive, Suite 108  
Irving, Texas 75062-2763

OR2016-15538

Dear Mr. Stool:

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# 624429.

The City of Grapevine (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city has released some of the requested 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 note the submitted information includes city police department officers' body worn camera recordings. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;
- (2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and

(3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.*

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007. For purposes of section 58.007, “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2). Section 58.007 of the Family Code provides, in part:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

...

(e) Law enforcement records and files concerning a child may be inspected or copied by a juvenile justice agency as that term is defined by Section 58.101, a criminal justice agency as that term is defined by Section 411.082, Government Code, the child, and the child’s parent or guardian.

...

(j) Before a child or a child's parent or guardian may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (e), the custodian of the record or file shall redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, or other law.

*Id.* § 58.007(c), (e), (j)(2). We have reviewed the remaining information and find it involves allegations of juvenile conduct in violation of a penal statute that occurred after September 1, 1997. Thus, this information is generally confidential under section 58.007(c). We note, and you acknowledge, the requestor is a parent of the juvenile offender listed in the report. Therefore, the requestor has a right to inspect juvenile law enforcement records concerning her juvenile child pursuant to section 58.007(e) of the Family Code. *See id.* § 58.007(e). Section 58.007(j) provides, however, that information subject to any other exception to disclosure under the Act or other law must also be redacted. *See id.* § 58.007(j)(2). Accordingly, we will address your claim under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

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 must reasonably explain how and why section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state release of the remaining information would interfere with a pending criminal prosecution. Based on your representations, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) is generally applicable to the remaining information. *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.*, (Tex. 1976).

However, we note, and you acknowledge, section 552.108 of the Government Code does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic front-page information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See Houston Chronicle*, 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*). The city must release basic information, even if the information does not literally appear on the front page of an offense or arrest report. Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1).

In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. With the exception of basic information, which you

state has been released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>1</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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NAY/bw

Ref: ID# 624429

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that because the requestor has a right of access to information being released in this instance, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.