



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 15, 2008

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2008-02132

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 302244.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for copies of any documents that reflect discussions, conflicts, or disagreements between two named individuals. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the information you have submitted.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(e-1) provides the following:

A governmental body that submits written comments to the attorney general under Subsection (e)(1)(A) shall send a copy of those comments to the person who requested the information from the governmental body. If the written comments disclose or contain the substance of the information requested, the copy of the comments provided to the person must be a redacted copy.

Gov't Code § 552.301(e-1). While the city sent to the requestor a copy of its written comments submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(A), the city redacted most of its discussion of the asserted exceptions from this copy. After review of the copy of the city's brief sent to the requestor, we conclude that the city redacted information from the copy that does not disclose or contain the substance of the information requested; therefore, we conclude that the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(e-1) of the Government Code.

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 id.* § 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). This office has held that a compelling reason exists to withhold information when third party interests are at stake or when information is made confidential by another source of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (construing predecessor statute). Although the city claims exceptions to disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.108 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege, section 552.107(1)). In failing to comply with section 552.301, the city has waived its claims under sections 552.107 and 552.108 and may not withhold any of the requested information under these exceptions. However, the need of a governmental body, other than the agency that is seeking an open records decision, to withhold information under section 552.108 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to withhold information from disclosure. Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991). Because you inform us that the Texas Attorney General's Criminal Justice Division ("Attorney General") objects to the release of the information at issue, we will consider this agency's claim regarding section 552.108. Further, section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness.

Section 552.108 (a)(1) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). 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 id.* §§ 552.108 (a)(1), 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You inform us that the Attorney General objects to the release of the submitted information under section 552.108 because its release would

interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation. Based on this representation, 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. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e.*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Therefore, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's claim under section 552.101.

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/jh

Ref: ID# 302244

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. James Clark
1128 Prince
Ginnell, Iowa 50112
(w/o enclosures)