



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 26, 2008

Ms. Cathie Childs  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Austin  
P.O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767-1088

OR2008-11796

Dear Ms. Childs:

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# 320045.

The Austin Police Department (the "department") received a request for copies of photographs, videos, measurements, field notes, and witness information related to a specified incident involving a train and a pedestrian. You state that all responsive information except for a video has been released. Although you take no position with respect to the requested video, you state that it may implicate the proprietary interests of Union Pacific Railroad ("UPR"). Accordingly, you state that the department notified UPR of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested video should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, we must address the department's procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information that it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the 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). Within fifteen business days of receiving the request, the governmental body must submit to this office (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *Id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). You state that the department received the original request for information on December 18, 2007. However, you did not request a ruling from or submit the required documents to this office until June 20, 2008. Consequently, we find that the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office.

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 Gov't Code § 552.302; Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can generally be overcome by demonstrating that 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)*. Because UPR's interests are at stake, we will address its arguments.

UPR contends that submitted video may not be disclosed because it has been made confidential by agreement. As part of the investigation into the incident at issue, the department requested to view a recording taken by a camera located on the train. The department received permission to video the laptop display while the recording was playing. UPR asserts that permission was granted "on the specific condition that the video would remain confidential and not part of a file that would be available outside of the criminal justice system." However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information to a governmental body anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). Thus, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the video created by the department falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). In its comments, UPR failed to raise any exceptions to disclosure or explain how the release of the requested video recording would affect its proprietary interests. Therefore, UPR has failed to provide us with any basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in the requested video recording, and the video recording may not be withheld under section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, the requested video 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 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,



Benjamin A. Diener  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BAD/jb

Ref: ID# 320045

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Marissa Gonzales  
Rosenthal & Watson  
6601 Vaught Ranch Road, Suite 200  
Austin, Texas 78730  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Burns  
Burns Anderson Jury & Brenner, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 26300  
Austin, Texas 78755-6300  
(w/o enclosures)