



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 26, 2008

Ms. Charlotte L. Staples
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
I-30 at Bryant-Irvin Road
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2008-08696

Dear Ms. Staples:

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# 313812.

The City of North Richland Hills (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all information pertaining to a specified incident and any complaints regarding a specified address. You state that you have released some of the information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created after the city received the request. The city need not release nonresponsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

Next, 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 information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, a governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(a), (b). You claim that the city received the present request on April 2, 2008. However, the copy of the e-mail request that you submitted is dated April 1, 2008, and you did not request a ruling from this office until April 16, 2008. *Cf. Gov't Code* § 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, we find that the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301.

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 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). 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). You have raised section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. Because the purpose of the informer's privilege is to protect the flow of information to a governmental body, rather than to protect a third person, the informer's privilege, unlike other claims under section 552.101 of the Government Code, can be waived. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 6 (1990). Thus, the informer's privilege does not constitute a compelling reason to withhold information for purposes of section 552.302. Section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). In failing to comply with section 552.301, the city has waived its claim under the common-law informer's privilege and section 552.108; therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on those grounds.

We note that the submitted information contains driver's license information. Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that "relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state."¹ Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1). The city must withhold the information we have marked under 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

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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

Sincerely,



Olivia A. Maceo
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

OM/mcf

Ref: ID# 313812

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kristi Davis
Con-way Freight
5555 Rufe Snow, Suite 5515
North Richland Hills, Texas 76180
(w/o enclosures)