



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 18, 2020

Ms. Captoria Brown  
Senior Paralegal  
City of Carrollton  
P.O. Box 110535  
Carrollton, Texas 75011-0535

OR2020-13907

Dear Ms. Brown:

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# 828699 (City ID Nos. 19204 and 19357).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for multiple categories of information pertaining to a specified incident. The city received a second request from a different requestor for video recordings pertaining to the same incident.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the first requestor seeks records not requested by the second requestor. Thus, the first request is broader than the second request. Accordingly, any submitted

---

<sup>1</sup> You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

information beyond the scope of the second request is not responsive to that request, and the city need not release information to the second requestor that is not responsive to the second request for information.

Next, we note you have only submitted video recordings pertaining to the specified incident in response to the first request for 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 first requestor seeks access. Please be advised, this open records letter ruling applies only to the 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 additional information existed on the date the city received the first request, we assume you have released it to the first requestor. If you have not released any such information, you 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(a) 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 information at issue relates to a pending criminal matter, and release of the information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the case. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the 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). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the submitted information. Accordingly, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information. Additionally, as we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted body worn camera video recording. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

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,

Kieran Hillis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/be

Ref: ID# 828699

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)