



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 28, 2004

Ms. Linda L. Sjogren
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Angelo - Legal Department
P.O. Box 1751
San Angelo, Texas 76902

OR2004-5256

Dear Ms. Sjogren:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 204128.

The San Angelo Police Department (the "department") received a request for a copy of a 9-1-1 call and the police officer's in-car videotape related to an incident that occurred on April 3, 2003. You state that you have released a copy of the 9-1-1 call to the requestor. You claim that the requested videotapes are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.119 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of the requested videotapes.¹

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

¹We assume that the representative sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach and, therefore, does not authorize the withholding of any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.

....

(b) An 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 is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). 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).

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 Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no writ). Under the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b), this office has stated that a governmental body may withhold certain information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *See e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 456 (1987) (release of forms containing information regarding location of off-duty police officers in advance would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 413 (1984) (release of sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 409 (1984) (if information regarding certain burglaries exhibits pattern that reveals investigative techniques, information is excepted under predecessor of section 552.108), 341 (1982) (release of certain information from Department of Public Safety would unduly interfere with law enforcement because release would hamper departmental efforts to detect forgeries of drivers' licenses), 252 (1980) (predecessor to section 552.108 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). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (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). To prevail on its claim that section 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; the determination of

whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

You state that release of the submitted videotape would "allow criminals to avoid detection and apprehension by the depicted officers if they encounter the officers out of uniform or working under cover." You also state that release of the videotape "would endanger the lives or physical safety of the officers depicted." You state that the officers depicted in the video tape are not undercover officers. However, you state that "the officer would be endangered if he or she later decides to work as an undercover officer." Upon review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude you have not demonstrated how release of the submitted videotape would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Therefore, you may not withhold the requested information under section 552.108(b)(1).

Section 552.119 of the Government Code provides:

(a) A photograph that depicts a peace officer as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure, or a security officer commissioned under Section 51.212, Education Code, the release of which would endanger the life or physical safety of the officer, is excepted from [required public disclosure] unless:

- (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information;
- (2) the officer is a party in a fire or police civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; or
- (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding.

(b) A photograph exempt from disclosure under Subsection (a) may be made public only if the peace officer or security officer gives written consent to the disclosure.

Gov't Code § 552.119. Under section 552.119, a governmental body must demonstrate, if the information does not demonstrate on their face, that release of the photograph would endanger the life or physical safety of a peace officer. Furthermore, a photograph of a peace officer cannot be withheld under section 552.119 if (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information; (2) the officer is a party in a fire or police civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding; or (4) the officer gives written consent to the disclosure.

In this instance, you have not demonstrated, nor is it apparent from our review of the submitted information, that release of the video tape would endanger the life or physical

safety of any of the officers depicted. We therefore determine that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted video tape pursuant to section 552.119 of the Government Code. Accordingly, because you claim no other exception to disclosure, we conclude the requested videotapes 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sarah I. Swanson". The signature is written in black ink and includes a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/seg

Ref: ID# 204128

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Miranda Sanchez
1142 Linda Lee
San Angelo, Texas 76905
(w/o enclosures)