



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 17, 2004

Mr. Ignacio Perez
Assistant City Attorney
City of McAllen
P. O. Box 220
McAllen, Texas 78505-0220

OR2004-6982

Dear Mr. Perez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 207432.

The City of McAllen (the "city") received a request for five categories of information regarding city vehicles. You claim that a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 did not, however, submit to this office a copy of the written request for information within fifteen business days of the city's receipt of the request for information. Consequently, you failed to comply with section 552.301.

¹To the extent that any additional requested information existed upon receipt of the request for information, we assume it has been released. If not, you must do so at this time. See Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; see also Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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 requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *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 have not provided a compelling reason under section 552.108 of the Government Code to overcome the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991) (need of another governmental body to withhold requested information may provide compelling reason for nondisclosure under section 552.108). Therefore, you may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. You also claim section 552.101 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure. This exception can provide a compelling reason for overcoming the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Thus, we will address your argument under this exception.

First, we note that section 552.130 of the Government Code prohibits the release of information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state or a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or authorized local agency. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Next, section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy. Ordinarily, information is protected by common-law privacy only if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). However, information also may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy upon a showing of certain "special circumstances." *See* Open Records Decision No. 169 (1977). This office considers "special circumstances" to refer to a very narrow set of situations in which the release of information would likely cause someone to face "an imminent threat of physical danger." *Id.* at 6. Such "special circumstances" do not include "a generalized and speculative fear of harassment or retribution." *Id.*

You seek to withhold the requested information related to undercover narcotics vehicles, and you assert that disclosure of such information would endanger the lives of undercover police officers. Upon review, we note that portions of the information you have marked appear to contain the names of police officers. If these officers are undercover police officers, we conclude that these names are confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and must be withheld. *See* Open Records Decision No. 169 (1977). If these officers are not undercover police officers, their names are not

protected by common-law privacy and must be released. Further, we cannot find that the remaining information would permit an individual to identify undercover narcotics vehicles and thus place the lives of undercover police officers in danger. Consequently, we conclude that the remaining information is not protected by common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld on this basis.

In summary, we conclude that: 1) the city must withhold the section 552.130 information we have marked; 2) if the marked names are those of undercover police officers, the city must withhold these names under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and 3) if the marked names are not those of undercover police officers, these names must be released. All remaining responsive information must be released.

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).

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,



W. Montgomery Meitler
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WMM/krl

Ref: ID# 207432

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Karol Montes
Citizens for a Better and Safer McAllen
1110 N. 5th
McAllen, Texas 78504
(w/o enclosures)