



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 16, 2014

Ms. P. Armstrong
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law and Police Section
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2014-06318

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

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# 520040 (ORR Nos. 2014-00900 & 2014-00966).

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for all internal affairs and public integrity records relating to a specified incident involving a named police officer and a second request from a different requestor for all 9-1-1 calls, police reports, and arrest warrant affidavits relating to the specified incident involving the named police officer. You state the department has redacted information pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Additionally, you claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹We note section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

²We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we address the department's claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable to information "collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business by a governmental body." Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(1). However, the Act's definition of "governmental body" "does not include the judiciary." *Id.* § 552.003(1)(B). Information "collected, assembled, or maintained by or for the judiciary" is not subject to the Act but instead is "governed by rules adopted by the Supreme Court of Texas or by other applicable laws and rules." *Id.* § 552.0035(a); *cf.* Open Records Decision No. 131 (1976) (applying statutory predecessor to judiciary exclusion under Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B) prior to enactment of Gov't Code § 552.0035). We note the department maintains this information and these records were developed by the department in the course of the investigation at issue. Consequently, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue was collected, assembled, or maintained by or for the judiciary. Accordingly, the information at issue is subject to the Act and we will consider your arguments against disclosure.

Next, we note the information we have marked is not responsive to the instant requests for information because it consists of copies of the requests and records created after the department received the requests for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the department is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Additionally, we note the submitted information includes documents that were filed with a court. Section 552.022 of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record," unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although the department seeks to withhold this information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the court-filed documents we have marked may not be withheld under section 552.108. However, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code 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 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does 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). You state the remaining responsive information relates to a pending criminal investigation and prosecution. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the release of the remaining responsive 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) (court delineates law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining responsive information.

As you acknowledge, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the department may withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

The department claims some of the basic information is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which 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, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information).

Because the information at issue relates to an alleged sexual assault, the department is generally required to withhold the identity of the complainant under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for this information.

at 685; ORD 393. However, we note the complainant at issue, who is also the alleged victim, is identified within the basic information only by a pseudonym. The use of a pseudonym sufficiently protects this complainant's identity within the information at issue. Thus, the department may not withhold the information you have marked in the basic information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the department 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/orl_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 providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/akg

Ref: ID# 520040

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)