



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 10, 2019

Mr. L. Brian Narvaez
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2019-09663

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

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# 766813 (Ref. No. P0010849-019).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us some of the submitted information was the subject of previous requests for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2019-06436 (2019). As we have no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed, the city must continue to rely on that ruling as a previous determination and withhold or release the information that was previously ruled on in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2019-06436. *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 a 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 submitted information was not previously ruled on, we will address your submitted argument.

Next, you acknowledge, and we agree, the city failed to meet the statutory deadlines imposed by section 552.301 of the Government Code for the remaining 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, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The need of a governmental body, other than the governmental body that failed to timely seek an open records decision, to withhold information under section 552.108 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991). Because you inform us the Collin County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") objects to the release of the information at issue, we will consider whether the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.

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 district attorney's office objects to the release of the remaining information because it pertains to a pending criminal investigation. 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, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.

In summary, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-06436 as a previous determination and withhold or release the submitted information that was previously ruled on in accordance with that ruling. The city may withhold the remaining 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jesse Harvey', with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Jesse Harvey
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JH/mo

Ref: ID# 766813

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)