



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 18, 2007

Ms. YuShan Chang
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2007-04370

Dear Ms. Chang:

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# 275958.

The Houston Police Department (the "department") received a request for a list of tasers purchased by the department, including model, brand, date of purchase, price, ID number, and the officer to whom it was assigned, as well as copies of both internal department paperwork and taser return forms and return dates. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code provides:

(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:

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 internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) protects information the public disclosure of which would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws); Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 531 at 2 (1989). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977).

You state that submitted information contains the identifying information of undercover and plainclothes police officers. You assert that releasing the identifying information of these officers and “the weapons that are at their disposal could greatly diminish the advantage of carrying a [t]aser in an undercover operation, the officer’s safety, and the criminal investigation itself.” You have also submitted an affidavit stating that release of the officers’ identities would “negatively impact officer safety.” Based on your representations, we conclude that you have demonstrated how release of the officers’ identities in the submitted information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 456 at 2 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 protected information that, if revealed, might endanger life or physical safety of law enforcement personnel), 211 at 4 (1978) (statutory predecessor protected identities of members of Attorney General’s Organized Crime Task Force engaged in undercover narcotics work). Thus, you may withhold the identities of the undercover officers in the submitted information under section 552.108(b)(1). However, the department has failed to demonstrate that the remaining information constitutes information that would interfere with law enforcement for section 552.108 purposes. Consequently, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is 1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and 2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Information may also be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy upon a showing of “special circumstances.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 169 (1977). This office considers “special circumstances” to refer to a very narrow set of situations in which the release of information would likely cause someone to

face “an imminent threat of physical danger.” *Id.* at 6. Such “special circumstances” do not include “a generalized and speculative fear of harassment or retribution.” *Id.*

In this instance, you argue special circumstances warrant withholding the remaining submitted information. You express generalized and speculative concerns that releasing information regarding the weapons the listed officers carry would pose an imminent danger to the officers. Upon review, we determine you have failed to demonstrate that release of the remaining information would present an imminent credible threat to the safety of the listed officers or any member of the public. Accordingly, as you have not established the existence of special circumstances, you may not withhold any of the submitted information on that basis.

In summary, the department may withhold the identities of the undercover officers in the submitted information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/sdk

Ref: ID# 275958

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jason Whitely
KHOU-TV, Channel 11
1945 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019
(w/o enclosures)