



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 20, 2007

Mr. Tom Ginter  
City Manager  
City of Madisonville  
210 West Cottonwood Street  
Madisonville, Texas 77864

**CORRECTED COPY**

OR2006-15116A

Dear Mr. Ginter:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2006-15116 (2006) on December 27, 2006. We have examined this ruling and determined that Open Records Letter No. 2006-15116 is incorrect. Where this office determines that an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for Open Records Letter No. 2006-15116. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of the Attorney General may issue a decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of the Public Information Act (the "Act"))).

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 267648A.

The Madisonville Police Department (the "department") received a request for the personnel files of two department police officers, including any complaints. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>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 must address the department's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), the governmental body must, within fifteen business days of receiving the request, submit to this office (1) 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. Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). You state that the department received the instant request on October 6, 2006. The envelope in which the department submitted the information required by section 552.301 bears a postmark date of December 19, 2006. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, the department failed to satisfy the procedural requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to submit to this office the information required in section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See 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). Generally, 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). Sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Gov't Code* § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103 ); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). In failing to comply with section 552.301, the department waived its claims under sections 552.103 and 552.108. However, the need of another governmental body to withhold information under sections 552.103 and 552.108 can provide compelling reasons under section 552.302. *See Open Records Decision* Nos. 586 (1991) (need of another governmental body to withhold information under statutory predecessor section 552.108 can provide compelling reason to overcome presumption of openness), 469(1987) (university may withhold information under section 552.103 predecessor to protect district attorney's interest in anticipated criminal litigation). You have submitted a letter from an assistant attorney with the United States Attorney's Office objecting to the release of the submitted information pursuant to sections 552.103 and 552.108. Therefore, we will consider the U.S. assistant attorney's arguments for withholding the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime... if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The U.S. assistant attorney states that the submitted information relates to pending criminal cases set in federal district court. The U.S. assistant attorney states that the officers may be called upon to testify as witnesses in these pending cases. We understand that the requested information could be used to undermine the officers’ credibility as witnesses. Upon review, we conclude that the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Accordingly, the department may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the U.S. assistant attorney’s remaining arguments against disclosure.

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).

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,



Debbie K. Lee  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DKL/eb

Ref: ID# 267648

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Kenavon T. Carter  
American Civil Liberties Union of Texas  
P. O. Box 12905  
Austin, Texas 78711  
(w/o enclosures)