



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

May 27, 2003

Mr. Clark T. Askins  
La Porte Assistant City Attorney  
Askins & Armstrong, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1218  
La Porte, Texas 77572-1218

OR2003-3561

Dear Mr. Askins:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 181700.

The City of La Porte Police Department (the "department") received a request for any records pertaining to two named individuals. You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim, however, that 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 address the department's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. You state that the department received the request on March 19, 2003. However, you did not provide this office with a copy of the written request for information until May 27, 2003. Thus the department failed to comply with section 552.301(e).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a

governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). You contend that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, you have not demonstrated a compelling reason for withholding this information under section 552.108. *See* Open Records Decision No. 473 at 2 (1987) (discretionary exceptions under the Public Information Act can be waived); *but see* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991) (when a governmental body fails to timely seek an attorney general decision under the Public Information Act, the need of another governmental body may provide a compelling reason for withholding the requested information). Nevertheless, we note that section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason.<sup>1</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1976) (confidentiality provisions and exceptions designed to protect the interests of third parties can provide compelling reasons for overcoming presumption of openness).

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Section 552.101 encompasses common-law privacy. Where an individual’s criminal history information has been compiled by a governmental entity, the information takes on a character that implicates the individual’s right to privacy. *See United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989). In this instance, the requestor asks for all information concerning two named individuals. In this case, we believe that the individuals’ right to privacy has been implicated. Thus, to the extent the department has responsive information where the named individuals are possible suspects or arrestees, we conclude that you must withhold this information under common-law privacy as encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See id.*

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.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

*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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Heather Pendleton Ross  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

HPR/sdk

Ref: ID# 181700

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Dawnette McNaughton  
14520 Wunderlich, Suite 120  
Houston, Texas 77069  
(w/o enclosures)