



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 6, 2007

Ms. Rebecca H. Brewer  
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Joplin, P.C.  
For The City of Frisco  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2007-01520

Dear Ms. Brewer:

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# 270788.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a copy of a specified incident report. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the 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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in pertinent part that "[i]nformation contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in any record compiled from the information contained in one or more certificates that identifies or tends to identify an owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of an owner of a vaccinated animal is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code." Health & Safety Code § 826.0211(a). The only exception to this confidentiality is that the information may be disclosed "to a governmental entity for purposes related to the protection of public health and safety." *Id.* § 826.0211(b). You assert that the submitted information falls within section 826.0211. However, you do not explain, nor can we discern, whether the submitted document is a rabies vaccination certificate or a record compiled from the information contained in one or more rabies certificates. *See* Gov't

Code § 552.301(e)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (express language of statutory confidentiality provisions controls the scope of confidentiality protection). Thus, the city has not established that section 826.0211 is applicable to the identifying information contained in the submitted document, and the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by section 826.0311 of the Health and Safety Code, which, in relevant part, states the following:

(a) Information that is contained in a municipal or county registry of dogs and cats under Section 826.031 that identifies or tends to identify the owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of the owner of the registered dog or cat is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code.

(b) The information may be disclosed only to a governmental entity for purposes related to the protection of public health and safety. A governmental entity that receives the information must maintain the confidentiality of the information, may not disclose the information under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may not use the information for a purpose that does not directly relate to the protection of public health and safety.

Health & Safety Code § 826.0311(a), (b). The submitted information consists of an incident report “Individual Animal Record” of the city’s Animal Services Department. Section 826.0311 only applies to the actual pet registry; it is not applicable to the contents of other records, even though those documents may contain the same information as the pet registry. *See* Open Records Decision No. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express, and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure). Thus, we find you have failed to establish that the submitted information is confidential under section 826.0311 of the Health and Safety Code, and the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

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 [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state.” Gov’t Code § 552.130. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Jaime L. Flores  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLF/jww

Ref: ID# 270788

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Olivia Espinoza  
Law Offices of Street & Ragsdale  
13101 Preston Road, Suite 600  
Dallas, Texas 75240-5232  
(w/o enclosures)