



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 17, 2016

Ms. Ylise Janssen  
General Counsel  
Austin Independent School District  
1111 West Sixth Street, Suite A240  
Austin, Texas 78703

OR2016-06193

Dear Ms. Yanssen:

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# 602273.

The Austin Independent School District (the "district") received a request for seven categories of information pertaining to the selection and hiring of campus principals and the district's superintendent. Although you do not take any position as to whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Ray & Associates, Inc. ("RAI"), of the request for information and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances).

Initially, we must address the district's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to subsection 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). You state the district received the request for information on December 14, 2015. As of the date of this letter, you have not submitted for our review a copy or representative sample of the information requested. Consequently, we find the district failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* ORD 630.

We note 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). However, as of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from RAI explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude RAI has a protected proprietary interest in any of the requested information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the requested information based upon the proprietary interests of RAI. Thus, we have no choice but to order the district to release the requested information in accordance with section 552.302 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

[orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](#), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cindy Nettles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "C" and a long, sweeping underline.

Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 602273

c: Requestor

Ray & Associates, Inc.  
4403 1st Avenue SE, Suite 407  
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402-3221