



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 12, 2020

Ms. Criselda Palacios
Counsel for the City of Alamo
Palacios Garza & Thompson, P.C.
2724 West Canton Road
Edinburg, Texas 78539

OR2020-15672A

Dear Ms. Palacios:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2020-15672 (2020) on June 9, 2020. Since that date, we have received new information that affects the facts on which this ruling was based. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on June 9, 2020. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act ("Act")). This ruling was assigned ID# 840895.

The City of Alamo (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified report. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim 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[.]" *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under 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); *ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to a pending criminal prosecution. Based upon your representation and our review, we find release of the information at issue 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.

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). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹

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,

Jahnna Ward
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JW/jm

Ref: ID# 840895

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹ We note the requestor has a right of access to the information at issue pursuant to section 261.201(k) of the Family Code. See Fam. Code § 261.201(k); Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party's representative, solely on grounds 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). Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a ruling from this office.