



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 5, 2019

Mr. Eric C. Farrar
Counsel for the City of Stafford
Olson & Olson LLP
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2019-31106

Dear Mr. Farrar:

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# 802523 (Ref. No. PD-910-2019).

The City of Stafford (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all information related to a specified investigation. You state you will redact information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and Open Records Decision 684 (2009).¹ You claim 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.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information consists of grand jury subpoenas and information that may have been obtained through grand jury subpoenas. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion.

considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury, and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411, 398 (1983). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information also is held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. Thus, to the extent the city holds the grand jury subpoenas and the information obtained through grand jury subpoenas solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the city is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the city holds the information at issue in its own capacity and not solely as an agent of the grand jury, we will address your argument against its disclosure.

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 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 that release of the submitted information will interfere with a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. We note, however, that the information at issue includes a citation, which was provided to the cited party. You have not explained how releasing this information, which has already been provided to the cited party, would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Accordingly, the citation may not be withheld under section 552.108. However, based upon your representations, we conclude that the release of the remaining information 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).

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-87; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information and the citation, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²


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

In summary, to the extent the city holds grand jury subpoenas and the information obtained through grand jury subpoenas solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the city is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. With the exception of basic information and the citation, which must be released to this requestor, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/mo

Ref: ID# 802523

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ 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, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.