



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 12, 2004

Ms. Melanie Barton  
Assistant District Attorney  
Dallas County  
411 Elm Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2004-9638

Dear Ms. Barton:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 213280.

Dallas County (the "county") received a request for, among other things, the parking records of two named judges over a specified time period. You state that the county has released the other requested information to the requestor. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Under this section, this office has determined that information may be withheld from public disclosure in special circumstances. In Open Records Decision No. 169 (1977), we considered the personal safety concerns of public employees and recognized that there may be specific instances where "special circumstances" exist to except from public disclosure some of the employees' addresses. See Open Records Decision No. 123 (1976). In that decision, the employees demonstrated that their lives would be placed in danger if their addresses were released to the public. ORD 169 at 7. This office further noted that the initial determination of credible threats and safety concerns should be made by the governmental body to which a request for disclosure is directed, and this office will determine whether a governmental body has demonstrated the existence of special circumstances on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* We noted, however, that "special circumstances" do not include "a generalized and speculative fear of harassment or retribution." *Id.* at 6.

You explain that the instant request seeks the parking garage entrance and exit times for criminal court judges. You assert that some of the individuals sentenced by these judges, and other individuals, "have felt inclined to seek retribution" against these criminal court judges. Additionally, you explain that the county maintains a secure parking area to help ensure the safety of these judges, as well as utilizing security checkpoints with metal detectors and x-ray machines, through which individuals entering the criminal courthouse must pass. You contend that release of the records at issue "would create a compromise of the security measures used to protect the judges and would likely cause them to face an imminent threat of physical danger if someone knew their comings and goings from the parking garage and/or courthouse." Further, you assert that "any individual bent on doing harm could simply strike before the targeted judge entered, or after the judge exited, the garage." Based on these representations and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that the county has demonstrated the existence of special circumstances regarding the judges in question. Accordingly, the county must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument.

Finally, you ask this office to issue a previous determination regarding the parking records of criminal court judges. We decline to issue such a determination at this time. 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# 213280

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Minnie Caruth  
7411 Green Brier  
Dallas, Texas 75225  
(w/o enclosures)