



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 20, 2007

Mr. Chris Schuchart  
Attorney at Law  
P.O. Box 1569  
Castroville, Texas 78009

OR2007-04514

Dear Mr. Schuchart:

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# 276372.

The City of LaCoste (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for "all tickets/citations by name of officer, by date, by time, and the reason for stopping [the individual]" for the past six months. We understand you to claim that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the city also raises section 552.305 of the Government Code, we note that section 552.305 is not an exception to disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305. Section 552.305 addresses the procedural requirements for notifying third parties that their interests may be affected by a request for information. *See id.*

<sup>2</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, you state that the city does not maintain a list of tickets by officer name.<sup>3</sup> You also state, however, that the city has a copy of the tickets on file, and you have submitted information which reflects this representation. The Act does not require a governmental body to answer factual questions, conduct legal research, or create new information in responding to a request for information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990). Likewise, a governmental body need not take affirmative steps to create or obtain information that is not in its possession, so long as no other individual or entity holds information on behalf of the governmental body that received the request for it. *See* Gov't Code § 552.002(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 534 at 2-3 (1989), 518 at 3 (1989). However, a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to information that is within the governmental body's possession or control. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990). As you have identified and submitted tickets which are responsive to the request, we will determine whether you must release this information to the requestor.

Next, we note that you have redacted information, including social security numbers, from the submitted documents. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body is prohibited from withholding information from a requestor without seeking a ruling from this office unless a statute authorizes such, or the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000) (delineating circumstances under which attorney general decision constitutes previous determination under section 552.301 of the Government Code). Pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, all governmental bodies may redact social security numbers without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). However, we are not aware of any law that authorizes the city to withhold any additional information without requesting a decision from this office. Further, you do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, that the city has been issued a previous determination authorizing the city to withhold additional information without seeking a ruling from this office. Because we are able in this instance to ascertain the nature of the information that you have redacted, we will address whether the city may withhold this information. In the future, however, you should refrain from redacting any information that is submitted to this office in seeking an open records ruling, unless the information at issue is subject to a previous determination issued by this office. Failure to comply with section 552.301 may result in the information being presumed public under section 552.302. *See id.* §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate and embarrassing facts the

---

<sup>3</sup> We note that the Act does not require the city to release information that did not exist when it received this request or create responsive information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *See id.* at 683. This office has found, however, that the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of members of the public are not excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) (absent special circumstances, the home addresses and telephone numbers of private citizens are generally not protected under the Act's privacy exceptions). Upon review, we find that you have failed to explain how any portion of the submitted information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. Therefore, you may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by a Texas agency is excepted from public release.<sup>4</sup> Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Therefore, the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130.

In summary, the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining 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).

---

<sup>4</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,



Melanie J. Villars  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MJV/sdk

Ref: ID# 276372

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Juan Avila  
15877 Buchel Street  
La Coste, Texas 78039  
(w/o enclosures)