



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 30, 2020

Ms. Charla Thomas
Assistant City Attorney
City of Temple
2 North Main Street, Suite 308
Temple, Texas 76501

OR2020-19088

Dear Ms. Thomas:

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# 841597.

The City of Temple (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. 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.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes the breath test results of an individual's blood alcohol content. Section 724.018 of the Transportation Code provides that "[o]n request of the person who has given a specimen at the request of a peace officer, full information concerning the analysis of the specimen shall be made available to the person or the person's attorney." Transp. Code § 724.018. Here, the requestor is the individual who submitted the specimen. Although you claim the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, a specific right of access provision prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 451 at 4 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exceptions to disclosure under statutory predecessor to Act). Therefore, the city must release the submitted intoxilyzer results pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code.

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 remaining information relates to an active criminal investigation. Generally, the release of information pertaining to an open case is presumed to interfere with the criminal investigation. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). We note, however, the information at issue includes a DIC-24 Statutory Warning and a DIC-25 Notice of Suspension. The DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms have previously been provided to the arrestee. Because copies of these documents have previously been released to the arrestee, we find the city has not shown release of these documents will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime, and this information may not be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). *See Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1)*. Because the remaining information has not been previously released, we conclude release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, with the exception of the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must release the submitted intoxilyzer results pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code. With the exception of the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining 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

¹ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Transp. Code § 724.018; 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, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.

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,

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/gw

Ref: ID# 841597

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)