



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 31, 2004

Ms. Ashley D. Fourt  
Assistant District Attorney  
Tarrant County  
401 West Belknap  
Fort Worth, Texas 76196-0201

OR2004-7421

Dear Ms. Fourt:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 207929.

The Tarrant County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") received a request for all records pertaining to a named individual and a specified cause number. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

We begin by addressing your representation that some of the submitted information relates to grand jury proceedings. This office has concluded that a grand jury is not a governmental body that is subject to the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code, so that records that are within the actual or constructive possession of a grand jury are not subject to disclosure under chapter 552. *See* Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B) (definition of governmental body does not include judiciary); Open Records Decision No. 513 at 3 (1988) (information held by grand jury, which is extension of judiciary for purposes of Act, is not itself subject to Act). When an individual or an entity acts at the direction of the grand jury

---

<sup>1</sup> We 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 ruling 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.

as its agent, information prepared or collected by the agent is within the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 513 at 3. Information that is not so held or maintained is subject to the Act and may be withheld from disclosure only if a specific exception to disclosure is shown to be applicable. *Id.* Thus, to the extent that the district attorney has custody of the submitted information as agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to disclosure under the Act. *Id.* at 4. The rest of this decision is not applicable to that information. To the extent that the district attorney does not have custody of the submitted information as agent of the grand jury, we address your arguments against disclosure.

We next note that the submitted information includes arrest warrants and the supporting affidavits for the warrants. The 78th Legislature recently amended article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to add language providing:

The arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, *is public information*, and beginning immediately when the warrant is executed the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the warrant and the affidavit available for public inspection in the clerk's office during normal business hours. A person may request the clerk to provide copies of the warrant and affidavit on payment of the cost of providing the copies.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 15.26 (emphasis added). Thus, arrest warrants and affidavits for arrest warrants that have been presented to a magistrate are made public and must be released under article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. As a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not apply to information that is made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Therefore, to the extent that the submitted arrest warrants and affidavits were presented to a magistrate, they must be released to the requestor under article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We have marked the type of information that must be released pursuant to article 15.26.

The rest of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Act. This section provides that

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under 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). In this instance, the remaining information consists of a completed investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body. The district attorney must release this information under section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 or expressly confidential under other law. Sections 552.103 and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions to public disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and may be waived.<sup>2</sup> As such, these sections are not "other law" that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the district attorney may not withhold any of the remaining information under sections 552.103 or 552.111. We note, however, the attorney work product privilege is also found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). The Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, however, only apply to "actions of a civil nature." TEX. R. CIV. P. 2. Accordingly, rule 192.5 does not apply to the criminal matter at issue here.

The district attorney also seeks to withhold the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. This section 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:

...

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) represents the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(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:

...

---

<sup>2</sup>See *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 may be waived).

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) represents the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). In *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379 (Tex. 1994), the Texas Supreme Court held that a request for a district attorney's "entire litigation file" was "too broad" and, quoting *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458 (Tex. 1993, orig. proceeding), held that "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case." *Curry*, 873 S.W.2d at 380.

In this instance, you assert that the requestor seeks access to the district attorney's entire file in the referenced criminal case. You inform us that the remaining documents consist of information assembled by prosecutors during the trial and appeal of the case. You assert that this information represents the prosecutors' work product and is protected from disclosure under *Curry v. Walker*. Based on your representations, we conclude that subsections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) are applicable in this instance.

We note, however, that section 552.108 does not except from disclosure "basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic front-page information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing 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). The district attorney must release basic front-page information under section 552.108(c), including a detailed description of the offense, even if that information does not literally appear on the front page of an offense or arrest report. *See Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). The district attorney may withhold the rest of the submitted information that is subject to the Act, except for arrest warrants and affidavits for arrest warrants that were presented to a magistrate, under section 552.108(a)(4) and (b)(3).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments.

In summary: (1) submitted information of which the district attorney has custody as agent of the grand jury is not subject to disclosure under the Act; (2) arrest warrants and affidavits for arrest warrants that were presented to a magistrate must be released under article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure; and (3) the district attorney may withhold the rest of the submitted information under subsections 552.108(a)(4) and (b)(3) of the Government Code, except for basic information that must be released under section 552.108(c).

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 "Amy Peterson".

Amy D. Peterson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ADP/sdk

Ref: ID# 207929

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Cassidy Knutson  
: Texas Defender Service  
: 412 Main Street, Suite 1150  
: Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)