



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 9, 2019

Ms. DeAndrea Bradford
Assistant City Attorney
Arlington Police Department
P.O. Box 1065
Arlington, Texas 76004-1065

OR2019-09557

Dear Ms. Bradford:

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# 758556 (Ref. No. 72752).

The Arlington Police Department (the "department") received a request for department policy and procedures from July 2017 regarding mentally ill suspects. You state the department will release some information. You claim some of 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. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *Id.* § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *See City of Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To demonstrate the applicability of this exception, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would

interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORD 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

The department states the information at issue, if released, would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution of crime. The department argues the information reveals the department's security components. The department further argues release of the information at issue would place an individual at an advantage during similar confrontations with police officers and would pose a security risk to the public and to law enforcement. Based on these representations and our review, we agree the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.¹

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. Section 552.101 encompasses the common-law physical safety exception. For many years, this office determined section 552.101, in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy, protected information from disclosure when "special circumstances" exist in which the disclosure of information would place an individual in imminent danger of physical harm. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 169 (1977) (special circumstances required to protect information must be more than mere desire for privacy or generalized fear of harassment or retribution), 123 (1976) (information protected by common-law right of privacy if disclosure presents tangible physical danger). However, the Texas Supreme Court has held freedom from physical harm does not fall under the common-law right to privacy. *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, LP. & Hearst Newspapers, LLC*, 343 S.W.3d 112 (Tex. 2011) (holding "freedom from physical harm is an independent interest protected under law, untethered to the right of privacy"). Instead, in *Cox*, the court recognized, for the first time, a separate common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure that exists independent of the common-law right to privacy. *Id.* at 118. Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, "information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm." *Id.* In applying this

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

new standard, the court noted “deference must be afforded” law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned that “vague assertions of risk will not carry the day.” *Id.* at 119. Upon review, we find you failed to demonstrate disclosure of the information at issue would create a substantial threat of physical harm to an individual. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.

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/sb

Ref: ID# 758556

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)