



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 19, 2010

Mr. Jason D. King
Akers & Boulware-Wells, LLP
Attorney for City of Marble Falls
6618 Sitio Del Rio Boulevard
Building E, Suite 102
Austin, Texas 78730

OR2010-05554

Dear Mr. King:

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# 376696.

The Marble Falls Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for all audio and video recordings of a specified incident. You claim the requested 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.

Initially, we must address the department's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Section 552.301(e) states, within fifteen business days of receiving the request, the governmental body must submit to this office a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *Id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(D). You state the department received the present request for information on January 12, 2010. However, you did not request a decision from this office or submit the information at issue until February 12, 2010. Consequently, the department failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Forth Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-81 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). You claim an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, which is discretionary and may be waived. *See Gov't Code* § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). However, the interests under section 552.108 of a governmental body other than the one that failed to comply with section 552.301 can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 at 2-3 (1991). The Burnet County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") asserts a law enforcement interest in the submitted information. Therefore, we will determine whether the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 on behalf of the district attorney.


You seek to withhold the submitted video recordings under section 552.108 of the Government Code. 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: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 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). In this instance, the district attorney objects to disclosure of the submitted information because its release would interfere with a pending criminal prosecution. Based on this representation and our review, we conclude that release of the submitted information 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 [14th 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). Thus, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php,

or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amy Shipp". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Amy" and the last name "Shipp" clearly distinguishable.

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

ALS/rl

Ref: ID# 376696

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)