



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 18, 2003

Mr. Sim W. Goodall  
Police Legal Advisor  
City of Arlington  
P.O. Box 1065  
Arlington, Texas 76004-1065

OR2003-9157

Dear Mr. Goodall:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 193346.

The Arlington Police Department (the "department") received four requests from the same requestor for several categories of information related to: a specified incident and internal affairs investigation; certain department policies, training, and complaints; general information about internal affairs investigations; and information related to the Arlington Convention Center and the City of Arlington's suites at The Ballpark.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>2</sup>

To the extent that any additional responsive information exists, we assume it has been released. If not, you must do so at this time. See Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; see

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the Public Information Act (the "Act") does not require the department to answer factual questions, perform legal research, or create new information in responding to a request. See Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 534 at 2-3 (1989); see also *AT&T Consultants, Inc. v. Sharp*, 904 S.W.2d 668, 676 (Tex.1995); *Fish v. Dallas Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 31 S.W.3d 678, 681 (Tex. App.—Eastland, pet. denied). However, the department must make a good faith attempt to relate a request to information it holds. See Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8 (1990).

<sup>2</sup>We note that some of the information submitted to this office in response to the October 6, 2003 request for information was created after the date of the department's receipt of this request. Chapter 552 of the Government Code does not require the department to release information that did not exist when it received the request for information. See *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). We have marked this information, and we will not address the applicability of the Act to it.

*also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

Section 552.103 requires concrete evidence that litigation may ensue. To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the department must furnish evidence that litigation is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Among other examples, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); (2) hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981). A governmental body may also establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated by the receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue

the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990).

You state that the department considers the requestor's communications as a threat for legal action. However, upon review of the submitted information, we find that you have failed to provide concrete evidence that litigation involving the department was anticipated at the time it received the instant requests for information. Consequently, we conclude that section 552.103 of the Government Code is inapplicable to the submitted information, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

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." Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We understand you to assert that a portion of the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information we have marked. *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).

However, section 552.108 is inapplicable to basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). We believe such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (listing basic information that must be released from offense report in accordance with *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of the basic offense and arrest information, the department may withhold the information we have marked from disclosure based on section 552.108. We note that you have the discretion to release all or part of the information at issue that is not otherwise confidential by law. Gov't Code § 552.007.

Finally, we note that the remaining submitted information concerns an internal affairs investigation. Section 552.108 is inapplicable where a complaint against a law enforcement officer does not result in a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (section 552.108 generally not applicable to internal administrative investigations involving law enforcement officers that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-526 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (construing statutory predecessor); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982) (stating that statutory predecessor was not applicable to internal affairs investigation file when no criminal charge against police

officer results from investigation). In this case, the remaining submitted information relates to an internal affairs investigation of violations of departmental policy, rather than to a criminal investigation. Investigations into non-criminal matters are not excepted from disclosure by section 552.108 of the Government Code. *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 526 (predecessor statute to section 552.108 not applicable where no criminal investigation resulted). Because the remaining submitted information does not relate to a criminal investigation, we find that the remaining submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.108, and it must be released.

In summary, we conclude that with the exception of the basic offense and arrest information, the department may withhold the information we have marked from disclosure based on section 552.108 of the Government Code. All remaining submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental

body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 193346

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Walter O. Workman  
c/o Sim W. Goodall  
City of Arlington  
P. O. Box 1065  
Arlington, Texas 76004-1065  
(w/o enclosures)