



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 31, 2008

Ms. Beverly West Stephens
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2008-04207

Dear Ms. Stephens:

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# 306224.

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to case number 70727100. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We begin by noting that one of the submitted documents is not responsive to the instant request for information, as it was created after the date that the city received the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city need not release that information in response to this request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986) (governmental body not required to disclose information that did not exist at time request was received).

We next note that some of the submitted information appears to have been obtained pursuant to grand jury subpoenas and summonses. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. *See Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B)*. This office has determined that a grand jury, for purposes of the Act, is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See Open Records Decision No. 411* (1984). Further, records kept by another person or entity acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered to be records in the

constructive possession of the grand jury and therefore are not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 398 (1983). *But see* ORD 513 at 4 (defining limits of judiciary exclusion). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean that such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information is also held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. Thus, to the extent that the city has possession of the submitted information as an agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to the Act. This decision does not address the public availability of any such information. To the extent that the city does not have possession of the submitted information as an agent of the grand jury, the information is subject to the Act and must be released unless it falls within an exception to public disclosure.

You acknowledge, and we agree, that the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. Section 552.301 prescribes procedures that must be followed in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires a governmental body to ask for the attorney general's decision and claim its exceptions to disclosure not later than the tenth business day after the date of its receipt of the written request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Section 552.301(e) requires a governmental body to submit to this office, not later than the fifteenth business day after the date of its receipt of the request, (1) written comments stating why the governmental body's claimed exceptions apply to the information that it seeks to withhold; (2) a copy of the request for information; (3) a signed statement of the date on which the governmental body received the request or evidence sufficient to establish that date; and (4) the specific information that the governmental body seeks to withhold or representative samples if the information is voluminous. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). If a governmental body fails to comply with section 552.301, the requested information is presumed to be subject to required public disclosure and must be released, unless there is a compelling reason to withhold any of the information. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ).

You concede that the city did not comply with its ten-business-day deadline under section 552.301(b). The city also failed to timely comply with section 552.301(e). The submitted information is therefore presumed to be public under section 552.302. This statutory presumption can generally be overcome when the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Section 552.108 of the Government Code 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. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977)

(statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). However, the law enforcement interests under section 552.108 of a governmental body other than the one that failed to comply with section 552.301 can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 at 2-3 (1991). You inform us that the Bexar County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") asserts a law enforcement interest in the submitted information. Therefore, we will determine whether the city may withhold the information on behalf of the district attorney under section 552.108. As sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code can also provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will address your arguments under these exceptions.

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 must reasonably explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You inform us, and have provided a letter from the district attorney stating, that the submitted information is related to a pending criminal case. The district attorney asserts that release of the information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the case. Based on your representation and the district attorney's letter, we conclude that section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable in this instance. *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).

Section 552.108 does not except from disclosure "basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic front-page information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88. The city must release basic information, including a detailed description of the offense, even if the information does not literally appear on the front page of an offense or arrest report. *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). The city may withhold the rest of the submitted information on behalf of the district attorney under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent that the city has possession of information as an agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to the Act. To the extent the city does not have possession of the submitted information as an agent of the grand jury, except for basic information which must be released, the city may

withhold the submitted information on behalf of the district attorney under section 552.108 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 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

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining claims.

contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cindy Nettles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Cindy" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Nettles".

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 306224

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John Roberts
439 Rigsby
San Antonio, Texas 78210
(w/o enclosures)