



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 1, 2016

Ms. P. Armstrong
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law & Police Section
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2016-26617

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

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# 641760 (ORR No. 2016-21987).

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108, 552.117, 552.1175, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

We note some of the responsive information may have been the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-22655 (2016). We have no indication there has been any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the responsive information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the department must rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-22655 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances

¹We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

²In this instance, as our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the responsive information was not previously ruled on, we will address your submitted arguments.

Next, you acknowledge, and we agree, the department failed to meet the statutory deadlines imposed by section 552.301 of the Government Code for the requested information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Although the department seeks to withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interest and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general), 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). However, the need of a governmental body, other than the one that failed to timely seek an open records decision, to withhold information under section 552.108 can provide a compelling reason under section 552.302. Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991). You assert, and provide documentation showing, the Dallas County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") has a law enforcement interest in the submitted information. Therefore, we will consider whether the department may withhold the submitted information on behalf of the district attorney's office under section 552.108.

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). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information 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 (Tex. 1977). You state, and submit documentation demonstrating, the district attorney's office objects to the release of the submitted information because it pertains to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable, and the release of the information at issue 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 submitted information.

However, we note 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). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information does not include information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. See *id.* Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office.³

In summary, to the extent the responsive information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the department must rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-22655 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. To the extent the responsive information was not previously ruled on, then, with the exception of basic information, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office.

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,



Britni Ramirez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BR/bhf

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

Ref: ID# 641760

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)