



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 3, 2005

Ms. Veronica Ocañas
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2005-01007

Dear Ms. Ocañas:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 218193.

The City of Corpus Christi (the “city”) received sixteen requests from the same requestor for information regarding the Ocean House Bed and Breakfast, “Bed and Breakfast” or “Special Events” permits, three named city council members, and the Policy and Procedures Manual of the Corpus Christi Police Department. You state that you have provided the requestor with a portion of the requested information. You also state that you have no responsive information regarding a portion of the request. We note that the Public Information Act (the “Act”) does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism’d); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986). You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, some of which consists of representative samples.¹

¹ We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes the minutes of public meetings of governmental bodies. The minutes and agendas of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public by statute. *See* Gov't Code §§ 551.022 (minutes and tape recordings), 551.043 (notice). Information made public by statute may not be withheld from the public under any of the Act's exceptions to public disclosure. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 544 (1990), 378 (1983), 161 (1977), 146 (1976). Accordingly, the minutes of the public meetings must be released in accordance with the Open Meetings Act.

Second, we note that the submitted information also includes a city ordinance. Because laws and ordinances are binding on members of the public, they are matters of public record and may not be withheld from disclosure under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 2-3 (1990) (laws or ordinances are open records), 221 at 1 (1979) ("official records of the public proceedings of a governmental body are among the most open of records"). Accordingly, the submitted city ordinance must be released.

Next, you acknowledge that the city has not sought an open records decision regarding the Corpus Christi Police Department Policy and Procedures Manual within ten business days as required by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of 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 section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). By your failure to comply with section 552.301, the city has waived its claim under section 552.108. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted Policy and Procedures Manual under section 552.108. Because you have not asserted any other exceptions to disclosure for this information, the city must release the Policy and Procedures Manual to the requestor.

In addition, we also note that although you claim that the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, you only provide arguments in support of your section 552.103 claim against disclosure. Thus, the city has waived its claims under sections 552.107 and 552.111. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested); *see also* Open Records Decision

Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general), 630 (1994) (section 552.107 is discretionary exception), 470 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 is discretionary exception). Further, the city has not demonstrated that any of the remaining information is confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302. Accordingly, we will only address your section 552.103 claim against disclosure.

A portion of the remaining submitted information consists of completed reports, which are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in relevant part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108;

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). In this instance, the completed reports must be released under section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are expressly confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108. Section 552.103 is a discretionary exception under the Act and does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (stating that governmental body may waive section 552.103). Thus the city may not withhold the completed reports under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As the city claims no other exceptions for this information, the completed reports must be released.

In regard to the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022, section 552.103 provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated

on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You explain that on November 12, 2004, the requestor filed suit against the city claiming that the city wrongfully denied the requestor a permit to operate the Ocean House Bed and Breakfast. The submitted documents also reflect that the city was involved in the pending lawsuit on the date the city received the present request. Further, the information at issue pertains to the pending lawsuit. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that section 552.103 of the Government Code is applicable to the information at issue.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, we conclude that the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 218193

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Gabi Canales
14134 Palo Seco
Corpus Christi, Texas 78418
(w/o enclosures)