



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 4, 2008

Ms. Jacquelyn Middlebrooks  
Assistant City Attorney  
Criminal Law and Police Section  
City of Dallas  
1400 South Lamar  
Dallas, Texas 75315

OR2008-07647

Dear Ms. Middlebrooks:

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# 311752.

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for all records relating to a fight between two police officers. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.117, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, you state that a portion of the information at issue was obtained pursuant to a grand jury subpoena. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined that a grand jury, for purposes of the Act, is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by another person or entity acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered to be records in the constructive possession of the grand jury and therefore are not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions

---

<sup>1</sup> To the extent any additional responsive information existed on the date the department received this request, we assume you have released it. If you have not released any such records, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Nos. 513 (1988), 398 (1983); *but see* Open Records Decision No. 513 at 4 (defining limits of judiciary exclusion). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean that such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information is also held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* Open Records Decision No. 513. Thus, to the extent that the department has possession of the submitted information as an agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to the Act. This decision does not address the public availability of any such information. To the extent that the department does not have possession of the submitted information as an agent of the grand jury, the information is subject to the Act and must be released unless it falls within an exception to public disclosure.

Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Some of the information you seek to withhold under section 552.108 relates to an internal affairs investigation. Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to information relating to an administrative investigation that did not result in a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.-El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). However, in this instance, you indicate that the internal investigation relates to a criminal investigation conducted by the department's Public Integrity Unit. You further state that the Dallas County District Attorney's Office requests this information to be withheld. Based on these representations, we conclude that releasing the information you have marked would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.-Houston [14<sup>th</sup> Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Accordingly, the remaining information is subject to section 552.108(a)(1).

We note, however, that basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.108. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d 177; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information made public by *Houston Chronicle*). Therefore, with the exception of

basic information, the department may withhold the remaining information pursuant to section 552.108.

In summary, to the extent that the submitted information is held by the department as an agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to disclosure under the Act. With the exception of basic information, the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1).<sup>2</sup>

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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,



Chris Schulz  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CS/mcf

Ref: ID# 311752

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tanya Eiserer  
Dallas Morning News  
508 Young Street  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
(w/o enclosures)