



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 31, 2006

Mr. Miguel A. Saldaña
Law Office of Miguel A. Saldaña
Brownsville Independent School District
Three North Park Place
Brownsville, Texas 78521

OR2006-12785

Dear Mr. Saldaña:

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# 264191.

The Brownsville Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all information pertaining to a complaint filed against a named employee of the district. You claim that the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information is an investigation conducted by the district's police department and some of the submitted information appears to have been obtained pursuant to grand jury subpoenas. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined that a grand jury, for purposes of the Act, is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by another

¹ Although you raise section 552.002 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, we note that section 552.002 is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.002 is a provision of the Act that defines "public information" for purposes of the Act. We also note that while you raised sections 552.026, 552.135 and 552.138 as exceptions to disclosure, you did not provide arguments explaining the applicability of these exceptions, nor did you identify information you wish to withhold under these exceptions. Thus, we presume you no longer assert these exceptions to disclosure. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

person or entity acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered to be records in the constructive possession of the grand jury and therefore are not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411 (1984), 398 (1983); *but see* Open Records Decision No. 513 at 4 (1988) (defining limits of judiciary exclusion). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean that such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information is also held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* Open Records Decision No. 513 (1988). Therefore, to the extent that the information at issue is held by the district's police department as an agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to disclosure under the Act. The rest of this decision is not applicable to such information. To the extent that the information at issue is not held by the district's police department as an agent of the grand jury, so as to be subject to the Act, we consider it with the remaining submitted information.

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 section encompasses confidentiality provisions such as section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

(a) The following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Because the submitted information consists of files, reports, records, communications, or working papers used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261, the information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. You have not indicated that the district's police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume that no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, the submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Accordingly, the district must withhold the submitted information from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code as information made confidential by law.

In summary, to the extent that the submitted information is held by the district's police department as an agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to disclosure under the Act. To the extent that this submitted information is not held by the district's police department as an agent of the grand jury, so as to be subject to the Act, it is subject to this ruling. The district must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument.

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 appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, 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 appeal 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,



Lisa V. Cubriel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LVC/eb

Ref: ID# 264191

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Laura B. Martinez
Brownsville Herald
1135 East Van Buren
Brownsville, Texas 78520
(w/o enclosures)