



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 20, 2019

Ms. Julie A. Masek  
Assistant General Counsel  
The Texas A&M University System  
301 Tarrow Street, 6th Floor  
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2019-26392

Dear Ms. Masek:

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# 794987 (ORR# C001683).

Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (the "university") received a request for information related to a specified case. The university states it will withhold or release some of the requested information in accordance with the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter No. 2018-02812 (2019). *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). The university claims 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 the university claims and reviewed the submitted 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 . . . 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 this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The university states the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude release of the information the university marked will 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). Accordingly, we find the university may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information to this requestor.<sup>1</sup>

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/gw

Ref: ID# 794987

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the university receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the university must again seek a decision from this office.