



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 9, 2004

Ms. Carol Day-Moss
Assistant District Attorney
Hunt County District Attorney's Office
P.O. Box 441
Greenville, Texas 75403-0441

OR2004-7688

Dear Ms. Day-Moss:

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# 208731.

The Hunt County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") received a request for all documents in the possession of the district attorney related to a named individual. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of the requested information.¹

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes a search warrant affidavit. Article 18.01(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides in relevant part:

A sworn affidavit setting forth substantial facts establishing probable cause shall be filed in every instance in which a search warrant is requested. The

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.

affidavit is public information if executed, and the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the affidavit available for public inspection in the clerk's office during normal business hours.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 18.01(b). Based on this provision, the submitted search warrant affidavit is deemed public. The exceptions found in the Act generally do not apply to information made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Division No.525 (1989) (statutory predecessor). Accordingly, we conclude that the district attorney must release the search warrant affidavit that we have marked to the requestor.

Next, we note that the submitted information contains a complaint. Article 15.04 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that "[t]he *affidavit* made before the magistrate or district or county attorney is called a 'complaint' if it charges the commission of an offense." Crim. Proc. Code art. 15.04 (emphasis added). Case law indicates that a complaint can support the issuance of an arrest warrant. *See Janecka v. State*, 739 S.W.2d 813, 822-23 (Tex. Crim. App. 1987); *Villegas v. State*, 791 S.W.2d 226, 235 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 1990, pet. ref'd); *Borsari v. State*, 919 S.W.2d 913, 918 (Tex. App.—Houston [14 Dist.] 1996, pet. ref'd) (discussing well-established principle that complaint in support of arrest warrant need not contain same particularity required of indictment). Although the submitted complaint appears to have been made before a magistrate, we are unable to determine whether it was presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of an arrest warrant. As we are unable to make this determination, we must rule in the alternative. To the extent that the complaint that we have marked was, in fact, "presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of an arrest warrant," it is made public by article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and must be released. To the extent that the marked complaint was not so presented, it is not made public by article 15.26 and must be disposed of along with the rest of the submitted information.

The remaining submitted information consists of a completed investigation made of, for, or by the district attorney. Section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code provides that this information is not excepted from required disclosure under the Act, except as provided by section 552.108, or unless the information is expressly confidential under other law. Although you claim that this information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, we note that these exceptions to disclosure are discretionary exceptions to disclosure under the Act that do not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.² Accordingly, we conclude that the district attorney may not withhold any portion of this information under sections 552.103, 552.107 or 552.111 of the

²Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or which implicates the interests of third parties. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.111). Discretionary exceptions, therefore, do not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential.

Government Code. 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 and no portion of the submitted information may be withheld on this basis. You also assert section 552.108 of the Government Code. Because information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld as provided by section 552.108, we will address this assertion.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code states in pertinent 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) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state [and]

(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:

...

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

(c) This section does not except from [required public disclosure] information that is basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3), (c). When a request essentially seeks the entire prosecution file, the information may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108 and the holding in *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379 (Tex. 1994) (discovery request for district attorney's entire litigation file may be denied because decision of what to include in file necessarily reveals prosecutor's mental impressions or legal reasoning). In this instance, we agree that the request encompasses the district attorney's entire case file at issue. *Curry* thus provides that the release of the information at issue would reveal the district attorney's mental impressions or legal reasoning. Accordingly, we agree that subsections 552.108(a)(4)(B) and (b)(3)(B) of the Government Code apply to the remaining submitted information.

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). We believe such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Company 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). In Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976), this office summarized the types of information made public pursuant to *Houston Chronicle*. See Open Records Decision No. 127 at 4 (1976). Thus, with the exception of the basic information that must be released, we conclude that the district attorney may withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to subsections 552.108(a)(4)(B) and (b)(3)(B) of the Government Code.

In summary, the search warrant affidavit that we have marked must be released pursuant to section 18.01(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The district attorney must release the marked complaint under article 15.26 if it was presented to a magistrate in support of the issuance of an arrest warrant. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, all remaining submitted information may be withheld under subsections 552.108(a)(4)(B) and (b)(3)(B) of the Government Code. Because our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments.

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,



Cary Grace
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ECG/jev

Ref: ID# 208731

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Adrienne A. Dunn
Broden & Mickelsen
2707 Hibernia
Dallas, Texas 75204
(w/o enclosures)