



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 29, 2022

Mr. Robert J. Davis  
Counsel for the Collin County Sheriff's Office  
Matthews, Shiels, Knott, Eden, Davis & Beanland, L.L.P.  
8131 Lyndon B. Johnson Freeway, Suite 700  
Dallas, Texas 75251

OR2021-12279

Dear Mr. Davis:

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# 944762 (File No. 1600/71860).

The Collin County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office"), which you represent, received a request for specified video recordings involving the requestor.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.119 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if: (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]" See Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." See *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex.

---

<sup>1</sup> The sheriff's office provides documentation showing it 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).

App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To prevail on its claim that subsection 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a governmental body must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state the submitted information consists of Detention Response Team (“DRT”) extraction videos. You state the information at issue, if released, “would substantially interfere with and impair the ability of the [sheriff’s office] to maintain safety and security” at the facility and allow individuals to develop ways to circumvent, counteract, or thwart security procedures. Based upon your representations and our review, we agree the release of the videos would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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,

Pearlie Gault  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

PG/eb

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

Ref: ID# 944762

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)