



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 23, 2022

Ms. Erin A. Higginbotham
Counsel for the City of Liberty Hill
Bojorquez Law Firm, PC
11675 Jollyville Road, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78759

OR2022-17943

Dear Ms. Higginbotham:

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# 953632 (COLH PRR No. R000476-032522).

The City of Liberty Hill (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for certain information pertaining to city employees, the city's employee policy handbook, and the general orders of the city's police department.¹ You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.139 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in part:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

- (b) The following information is confidential:

¹ You state, and provide documentation showing, 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).

- (1) a computer network vulnerability report;
- (2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use;
- ...
- (4) information directly arising from a governmental body's routine efforts to prevent, detect, investigate, or mitigate a computer security incident, including information contained in or derived from an information security log.

Gov't Code § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2), (b)(4). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides in part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

- (1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency;
- (2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or
- (3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

Id. § 2059.055(b). You assert some of the submitted information is confidential under section 552.139. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue relates to computer network security, or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network as contemplated by 552.139(a), consists of a network vulnerability report or assessment as contemplated by section 552.139(b), or relates to restricted information under 2059.055. Accordingly, section 552.139 is not applicable to this information and the city may not withhold any of it on that basis.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *Id.* § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and

why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). 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 at 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). 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 (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.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 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 some of the submitted information, if released, would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. You argue disclosure of the information at issue “would place an individual at an advantage in confrontations with police officers and would increase his chances of evading arrest or injuring an officer or other persons.” Based on these representations and our review, we agree the release of some of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. However, we find you have not demonstrated release of any of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Consequently, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1), and the city must release it.

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,

Gerald A. Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/jm

Ref: ID# 953632

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)