



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 1, 2006

Ms. Bonnie Lee Goldstein
Bonnie Lee Goldstein, P.C.
P.O. Box 140940
Dallas, Texas 75214-0940

OR2006-05745

Dear Ms. Goldstein:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 251173.

The City of Italy (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for (1) the termination records of a named individual, (2) the "Public Works Audit," and (3) the "Police Department Audit." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

As a preliminary matter, you inform us that the requested information pertaining to the two audits was the subject of two previous requests for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2006-03051 (2006) and 2006-01196 (2006). Assuming there has not been a change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which these prior rulings were based, we conclude that the city may continue to rely on our decisions in Open Records Letter Nos. 2006-03051 and 2006-01196 with respect to the audits that were

subject to those rulings. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(f); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (setting forth the four criteria for a "previous determination").¹

To the extent the city holds any additional information responsive to this request, we assume that you have released it to the requestor. If you have not released any such information, you must release it to the requestor at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; 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 under circumstances). As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your arguments.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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).

¹The four criteria for this type of "previous determination" are (1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code; (2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; (3) the attorney general's prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and (4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior attorney general ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/eb

Ref: ID# 251173

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Aaron Itson
Neotribune, Inc.
177 Rome Park Place
Italy, Texas 76651
(w/o enclosures)