



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 21, 2003

Ms. Misty A. Hataway
Strasburger & Price, L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 4300
Dallas, Texas 75202-3794

OR2003-8403

Dear Ms. Hataway:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 191403.

The City of Grapevine (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for certain resolutions pertaining to traffic control signals at a particular intersection for certain years, and resolutions pertaining to the opening of the Grapevine Mills Mall for certain years. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information consists of city council resolutions and their incorporated attachments. In Open Records Decision No. 551 (1990), this office addressed whether a city ordinance could be withheld from the public under the Public Information Act and stated that:

It is difficult to conceive of a more open record. The law, binding upon every citizen, is free for publication to all. *Banks v. Manchester*, 128 U.S. 244, 253 (1888). This policy is based on the concept of due process which requires that the people have notice of the law. *Building Officials & Code Admin. v. Code Technology, Inc.*, 628 F.2d 730, 734 (1st Cir. 1980). Given this constitutional consideration, it is difficult to hypothesize a circumstance that would bring a law or ordinance within an exception to public disclosure.

We believe that the submitted city council resolutions are analogous to ordinances. Accordingly, we do not consider your claim under section 552.103, and the city must release to the requestor the submitted city council resolutions and attachments.

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. *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).

Ms. Misty A. Hataway - Page 3

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,



Kristen Bates
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/lmt

Ref: ID# 191403

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Constance M. Maher
The Maher Law Firm
3020 Matlock Road, Suite 120
Arlington, TX 76015
(w/o enclosures)