



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 29, 2019

Ms. Sarah M. Griffin
Counsel for the City of Pflugerville
Denton, Navarro, Rocha, Bernal, Hyde & Zech, P.C.
2500 West William Cannon, Suite 609
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2019-30442

Dear Ms. Griffin:

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# 793706 (City ID# Pflugerville-W008649-080719).

The City of Pflugerville (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for twelve categories of information related to the investigation of the requestor's client. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have submitted only representative samples of information related to categories 3, 10, and 11 of the requested information. You have not submitted information responsive to the remaining categories of requested information. Although you state the city has submitted a representative sample of the requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of all the types of information to which the requestor seeks access. Please be advised, this open records letter ruling applies only to the

¹ Although the city raises section 552.148 of the Government Code, it makes no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume the city has withdrawn its claim this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302. Additionally, although the city also raises section 552.305 of the Government Code, we note section 552.305 is not an exception to disclosure under the Act. Rather, section 552.305 provides the procedural requirements for notifying third parties that their interests may be affected by a request for information. *See id.* § 552.305.

types of information you have submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the city to withhold any information that is substantially different from the types of information you submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with requirements of Gov't Code § 552.301, information at issue is presumed to be public). Accordingly, to the extent any information responsive to the remaining categories 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 id.* §§ 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).

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

...

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution [.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). A governmental body raising section 552.108 must explain the applicability of section 552.108. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(1) or subsection 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982).

You state exhibits C-1 through C-4 contain the mental impressions and investigative notes of police department investigators in criminal investigations. You assert the information at issue is an internal record or notation that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of a crime that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution. You explain some of the information at issue relates to pending criminal investigations and prosecutions. You state release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution. You also explain the city does not possess the technological capability to redact the information at issue from the video files in Exhibit C-4. Based on your representation and our review, we find release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you indicated and Exhibit C-4 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code as well as the additional information you indicated under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.² See Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983)

Section 552.111 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. See *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 exempts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; see also *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); see ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion,

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You assert the remaining information in Exhibits C-1 through C-3 is subject to section 552.111. Upon review, we find the remaining information at issue consists of general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of child victims of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the names of the child victims in Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Additionally, you assert the names of the complainants in Exhibit E should be withheld under common-law privacy. You do not explain, nor do the documents reveal on their face, how this information would identify any victims of sexual assault. Nevertheless, we conclude that to the extent this information

reveals the identity of a sexual assault victim, the city must withhold the names of the complainants in Exhibit E under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you indicated and Exhibit C-4 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code as well as the additional information you indicated under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the names of the child victims in Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information reveals the identity of a sexual assault victim, the city must withhold the names of the complainants in Exhibit E under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city 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 <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,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/jxd

Ref: ID# 793706

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)