



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 18, 2005

Ms. Julia M. Vasquez
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Wichita Falls
P.O. Box 1431
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307

OR2005-10467

Dear Ms. Vasquez:

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# 236581.

The City of Wichita Falls (the "city") received a request for specified categories of information pertaining to the Wichita Falls Police Department's use of Tasers. You state that you have released some of the requested information but claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You claim that the submitted training materials are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

(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(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in [a law

enforcement agency], avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine [law enforcement] efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has stated that under the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b), a governmental body may withhold information that would reveal law enforcement techniques or procedures. *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 exhibit a pattern that reveals investigative techniques, information is excepted under predecessor to 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). To claim this exception, a governmental body must explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301; Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Generally known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *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 are not protected under predecessor to section 552.108), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state that the submitted training materials contain “specific training information and guidelines for police officers in the use of Tasers when confronted by violence or threatened by violence when effecting an arrest, protecting the public safety, or the safety of the arresting officer.” Furthermore, you explain that release of this information would provide an advantage to criminal suspects during confrontations with police officers and could increase the chance of injury to police officers and other persons during such confrontations. Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the release of some of the submitted information would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may withhold the portions of the submitted information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. We find, however, that the city has not demonstrated how release of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

Lastly, we note that some of the submitted information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish

copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the city may withhold the portions of the submitted information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released. In releasing the remaining information, however, the city must comply with applicable copyright laws for any information protected by copyright.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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 "L. Joseph James".

L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 236581

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rickey G. Bunch
The Law Office of Rickey G. Bunch
P.O. Box 3421
Wichita Falls, Texas 76301-0421
(w/o enclosures)