



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 30, 2019

Mr. John M. Cooper  
Assistant Criminal District Attorney  
Rockwall County  
1111 East Yellowjacket Lane, Suite 201  
Rockwall, Texas 75087

OR2019-30702

Re: Request for all records, statements, report etc re seizure of dog; 08/03/19

Dear Mr. Cooper:

The Office of the Attorney General has received your request for a ruling and assigned your request ID# 797095.

After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we have determined your request does not present a novel or complex issue. Thus, we are addressing your claims in a memorandum opinion. You claim the submitted information may be withheld from public disclosure pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of another law enforcement agency with a law enforcement interest.<sup>1</sup> Further, you inform this office the other law enforcement agency objects to the disclosure of the information because it relates to an ongoing criminal case and release would interfere with the case. Thus, we conclude you may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1) on behalf of the other law enforcement agency. However, you must release the basic information pursuant to section 552.108(c) of the Government Code.

For more information on the cited exception, please refer to the open government information on our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/governmental-bodies/open-records-memorandum-rulings>. You may also contact our Open Government Hotline at 1-877-OPENTEX.

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>We note you did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e). Nonetheless, 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).