



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2022

Mr. Daniel Sylvia
Counsel for the City of Liberty
Olson & Olson LLP
1517 Trinity Street
Liberty, Texas 77575-4628

OR2022-38960

Dear Mr. Sylvia:

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# 989792.

The City of Liberty (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to any internal investigation of a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.108 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

[T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information consists of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the submitted information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or

other law. *See id.* Although you raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for the submitted information, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Additionally, because information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code may be withheld under section 552.108 we will consider your argument under this exception for the submitted information. 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). 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). The information at issue pertains to an internal investigation of a former city employee. However, you state this information relates to a criminal prosecution, and assert release of the information at issue would interfere with the pending prosecution. Based upon your representation, we conclude the release of the submitted information 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). Accordingly, 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

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

Mr. Daniel Sylvia - Page 3

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,

Amy Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/eb

Ref: ID# 989792

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)