



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 18, 2016

Mr. John A. Haislet
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of College Station
P.O. Box 9960
College Station, Texas 77842

OR2016-16134

Dear Mr. Haislet:

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# 618811 (Open Records Request No. 160502.3).

The City of College Station (the "city") received a request for all information related to a specified investigation relating to a specified arrest. You state you will release some information to the requestor, including the CR-3 crash report pursuant to section 550.065 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(c) (providing for release of accident report to person or entity listed under this subsection). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Article 2.139 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, as added by House Bill 3791 by the 84th Texas Legislature,¹ provides:

A person stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under Section 49.04, 49.045, 49.07, or 49.08, Penal Code, is entitled to receive from a law enforcement agency employing the peace officer who made the

¹Act of May 30, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 1124, § 1 (codified at Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.139).

stop or arrest a copy of any video made by or at the direction of the officer that contains footage of:

- (1) the stop;
- (2) the arrest;
- (3) the conduct of the person stopped during any interaction with the officer, including during the administration of a field sobriety test; or
- (4) a procedure in which a specimen of the person's breath or blood is taken.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.139. We note you have submitted video recordings made by or at the direction of officers employed by the city's police department (the "department") that contain footage of the requestor being stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under section 49.04 of the Penal Code and a procedure in which a specimen of the person's breath or blood is taken. *See* Penal Code § 49.04 ("A person commits an offense if the person is intoxicated while operating a motor vehicle in a public place."). Therefore, the requestor is entitled to receive a copy of the video recordings we have indicated pursuant to article 2.139 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Although you assert sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code to withhold this information, a statutory right of access prevails over the Act's general exceptions to public disclosure. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exception to disclosure under the Act). Because sections 552.103 and 552.108 are general exceptions under the Act, the requestor's statutory access under article 2.139 prevails and the city may not withhold the video recordings we have indicated under section 552.103 or section 552.108. As you raise no further exceptions against disclosure of this information, the video recordings we indicated must be released.

Next, we note the remaining information includes the arrestee's blood test results. Section 724.018 of the Transportation Code provides, "[o]n the request of a person who has given a specimen at the request of a peace officer, full information concerning the analysis of the specimen shall be made available to the person or the person's attorney." Transp. Code § 724.018. Here, the requestor is the authorized representative of the individual who submitted the specimen. Although you seek to withhold this information under sections 552.103 and 552.108, as noted above, a statutory right of access generally prevails over the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act. *See* ORDs 613 at 4, 451. Therefore, the city must release the information, which we have marked, pertaining to the analysis of a blood specimen to the requestor under section 724.018 of the Transportation 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 claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the remaining information relates to a pending criminal investigation by the department. We note the remaining information includes a DIC-24 statutory warning. Because a copy of this document, which we have marked, has been provided to the arrestee, we find its release will not interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1)*. Therefore, the city may not withhold the marked statutory warning under section 552.108(a)(1). Based upon your representation and our review, we conclude release of the remaining information 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) (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 remaining information.

We note, however, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing the types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes, among other things, a detailed description of the offense. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of the marked DIC-24 statutory warning and basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1).

Next, we address your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under

Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

We note the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information related to litigation through the discovery process. See ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, any information obtained from or provided to all other parties in the anticipated or pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. We note the submitted DIC-24 statutory warning was provided to the arrestee. Furthermore, basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. ORD 597. Therefore, the city may not withhold the DIC-24 statutory warning or basic information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must release (1) the video recordings we have indicated pursuant to article 2.139 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and (2) the submitted results of the analysis of the blood specimen pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code. With the exception of the marked DIC-24 statutory warning and basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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.

²We note the requestor has a right of access beyond that of the general public to some of the information being released. See Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.139; Transp. Code § 724.018; see also Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual asks governmental body to provide him with information concerning himself). Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this information from an individual other than this requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

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,



Kavid Singh
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KVS/bhf

Ref: ID# 618811

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)