ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 29, 2008

Mr. Miguelangel Matos
Denton, Navarro, Rocha, & Bernal
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212

OR2008-05773

Dear Mr. Matos:

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# 308778.

The City of Dilley (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for fourteen categories of information, including the certified agenda or tape recording of the executive sessions of three specified city council meetings. You state that you have provided some of the requested information to the requestor, and we understand that the city does not have information responsive to portions of the request.[1] You claim that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim.

Initially, you inform us that the city asked the requestor for clarification of some of the requested information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed). You inform us that the requestor has not yet responded to this request for clarification; therefore, the city is not required to release any responsive information for which it sought clarification. However, if the requestor responds to the clarification request, the city must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any

[1]We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.— San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

responsive information from the requestor. *See* Open Records Decision No. 663 (1999) (ten-business-day deadline tolled while governmental body awaits clarification).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 551.104 of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code. Section 551.104 provides in part that "[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3)." *Id.* § 551.104 (c). Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request.[2] *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-995 at 5-6 (1988) (public disclosure of certified agenda of closed meeting may be accomplished only under procedures provided in Open Meetings Act). Section 551.146 of the Open Meetings Act makes it a criminal offense to disclose a certified agenda or tape recording of a lawfully closed meeting to a member of the public. *See* Gov't Code § 551.146(a)-(b). We therefore conclude that the city must withhold the responsive certified agenda from the closed session under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104 of the Government Code.

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

[2]We note that the city is not required to submit a certified agenda or tape recording of a closed meeting to this office for review. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (attorney general lacks authority to review certified agendas or tapes of executive sessions to determine whether a governmental body may withhold such information from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.101 of the Government Code).

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

Sincerely,

Allan D. Meesey
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ADM/eeg

Ref: ID# 308778

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Glen D. Mangum
Law Office of Glen D. Mangum
111 Soledad, Suite 725
San Antonio, Texas 78205-2381
(w/o enclosures)