



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 12, 2014

Ms. Juanita Dovalina  
Administrative Assistant  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Laredo  
P.O. Box 579  
Laredo, Texas 78042-0579

OR2014-02648

Dear Ms. Dovalina:

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# 513701 (Laredo ORR W003352-111113).

The City of Laredo (the "city") received a request for the logs of 9-1-1 calls from either of two specified addresses during a specified time period, dispatch logs for three named police officers and communications pertaining to a call to a specified address, dispatch logs for a named police officer for a specified incident, and certain employment information for four named police officers. You claim 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.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present request for information because it was created after the present request for information was received.<sup>1</sup> This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request, create responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by the governmental body or on its behalf. See *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

responsive to the request, and the city need not release such information in response to this request.

Next, we note some of the responsive information is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> 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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under [chapter 261 of the Family Code] and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Some of the responsive information pertains to an investigation by the city’s police department (the “department”) of alleged or suspected child abuse and falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1) (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). As you do not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, and based on our review, we conclude the information we have marked must be withheld in its entirety under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201(a).<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

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). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). In this instance, some of the remaining responsive information is personnel file information pertaining to the named police officers. Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to purely administrative records that do not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *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, you state, and submit correspondence from the Webb County District Attorney’s Office (the “district attorney’s office”) representing, the information at issue relates to a criminal case that is pending prosecution by the district attorney’s office, which objects to the release of the information at issue. Based upon these representations and our review, we determine release of the information at issue 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) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.108(a)(1).<sup>4</sup>

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The city may withhold the remaining responsive 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/ori\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/ori_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lindsay E. Hale". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "L".

Lindsay E. Hale  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LEH/tch

Ref: ID# 513701

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)