



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2022

Mr. Tessa Meredith
Counsel for the City of Commerce
Messer Fort McDonald
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-38943

Dear Ms. Meredith:

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# 985666 [ORR ID: COM092022JC].

The City of Commerce (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's background check. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state you notified the Greenville Police Department (the "department") of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the department. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the city failed to meet the statutory deadlines imposed by section 552.301 of the Government Code for the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The need of a governmental body, other than the governmental body that failed to timely seek an open records decision, to withhold information can provide a compelling reason sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision

No. 586 (1991). Because the department objects to the release of the information at issue, we will consider whether the city may withhold the submitted information under sections 552.108 and 552.111 of the Government Code on behalf of the department.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution). We also note section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to criminal conduct. *See* Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where an agency has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108 as information relating to a case of another law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration the information relates to the case and a representation from the other agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. The department objects to the release of the information at issue since it relates to a closed criminal investigation into the underlying incident conducted by the department that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information we marked. Thus, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code on behalf of the department.¹ However, we find the department has failed to establish the remaining information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) 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 . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d at 327 (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) protected information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed use of force guidelines), 456 (1987) (information regarding location of off-duty police officers), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

measures to be used at next execution). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable 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 (1980) (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the release of the information would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution efforts. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

Upon review, we find the department has not shown the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the department. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code on behalf of the department. The remaining information must be released.²

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,

Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/pt

Ref: ID# 985666

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

² We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See 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.