



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 5, 2017

Ms. Akilah Mance
Counsel for the City of Prairie View
Olson & Olson LLP
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2017-07091

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# 652119 (City Ref. COPV17-001).

The City of Prairie View (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for (1) information pertaining to an internal affairs investigation involving the requestor, (2) information pertaining to an investigation conducted by the city's mayor pertaining to the requestor, and (3) city policies pertaining to the discipline of city employees. You inform us you released information responsive to the first category of the request. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have not submitted any city policies pertaining to the discipline of city employees. To the extent any information responsive to this portion of the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a),

.302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, you state some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-26771 (2016). Upon review, however, we find the facts and circumstances have changed with respect to the requested information at issue in the previous ruling. Accordingly, the city may not rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-26771 as a previous determination. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances 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). However, we will consider your arguments for the information at issue.

We also note the submitted information includes police 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 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) 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 provide the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the body worn camera recordings at issue were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.¹ However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by [s]ubsection (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).

¹As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

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: (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 the submitted information relates to a pending criminal prosecution. Based on your representation, we conclude 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 remaining information.

However, we note, and you acknowledge, 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 types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

In summary, as the body worn camera recordings at issue were not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. With the exception of the basic information, which must be released, 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, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

²As our ruling is dispositive of this information, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure, except to note basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

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 'Meagan J. Conway', written in a cursive style.

Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJC/sb

Ref: ID# 652119

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)