



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 21, 2016

Mr. T. Daniel Santee  
Counsel for City of La Vernia  
Denton, Navarro, Rocha, Bernal, Hyde, & Zech, P.C.  
2517 North Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2016-21303

Dear Mr. Santee:

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# 630697.

The City of La Vernia (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified internal affairs investigation and the standard operating procedures of the city's police department. The city states it has provided some of the requested information to the requestor, but claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a city police officer's 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 the following:

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). 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 these recordings and the city is not required to release them.<sup>1</sup> 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.* § 1701.661(b).

Section 552.108(a) 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: (1) 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 the release of the information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). However, section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the criminal investigation or prosecution of alleged misconduct. *See, e.g., Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 526 (Tex. 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). The remaining information consists of an internal administrative investigation of a city police officer. Nevertheless, the city states the Wilson County Attorney’s Office objects to the release of the remaining information because it would interfere with a pending criminal prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the 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, 186-87 (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). Thus, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other arguments of the city to withhold this information.


<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other argument of the city to withhold this information.

To conclude, the city is not required to release the submitted body worn camera recordings. The city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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,

  
James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/bw

Ref: ID# 630697

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)