



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 16, 2008

Ms. Andrea Sheehan
Law Offices of Robert E. Luna, P.C.
4411 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75205

OR2008-09638

Dear Ms. Sheehan:

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# 316400.

The Frisco Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a named district employee that was created from April 7, 2008 through April 25, 2008. You claim that the requested information is not subject to the Act. In the alternative, you claim that portions of the requested information are exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that one of the submitted documents is not responsive to the instant request because it was created before April 7, 2008. We have marked the non-responsive document. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the district is not required to release that information in response to the request.

Next, you claim that the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act is only applicable to "public information." *See* Gov't Code § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) defines public information as "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business: (1) by a governmental body; or (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or

has a right of access to it.” *Id.* § 552.002(a). Information that is collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party may be subject to disclosure under the Act if it is maintained for a governmental body, the governmental body owns or has a right of access to the information, and the information pertains to the transaction of official business. *See* Open Records Decision No. 462 (1987).

After reviewing the information at issue, we agree that the responsive documents do not constitute “information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business” by or for the district. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.021; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995) (statutory predecessor not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Thus we conclude that the responsive documents are not subject to the Act, and need not be released in response to this request. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Jordan Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JH/jb

Ref: ID# 316400

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jennifer Ellis
7608 Jennifer Lane
Frisco, Texas 75034
(w/o enclosures)