



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 17, 2008

Ms. Nancy S. Harris
CASA Child Advocates of Montgomery County, Inc.
412 West Phillips, Suite 107
Conroe, Texas 77301

OR2008-05176

Dear Ms. Harris:

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# 307859.

The CASA Child Advocates of Montgomery County, Inc. ("CASA") received a request for "a copy of the check register for [CASA] for all checks issued for the years 2006 and 2007." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You assert that the requested information "contain[s] account information and information regarding donors[,] " which you claim is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. Upon review, we find that CASA has failed to demonstrate how any of the submitted information constitutes a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number subject to section 552.136. We therefore conclude that CASA may not withhold any of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.136.

We note that those portions of the information that identify donors of CASA are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the holding of the Texas Supreme

Court in *In re Bay Area Citizens Against Lawsuit Abuse*, 982 S.W.2d 371 (Tex. 1998).¹ In that decision, the Texas Supreme Court determined that the First Amendment right to freedom of association could protect an advocacy organization's list of contributors from compelled disclosure through a discovery request in pending litigation. In reaching this conclusion, the court stated:

Freedom of association for the purpose of advancing ideas and airing grievances is a fundamental liberty guaranteed by the First Amendment. *NAACP v. Alabama*, 357 U.S. 449, 460, 78 S.Ct. 1163, 2 L.Ed.2d 1488 (1958). Compelled disclosure of the identities of an organization's members or contributors may have a chilling effect on the organization's contributors as well as on the organization's own activity. *See Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 66-68, 96 S.Ct. 612, 46 L.Ed.2d 659 (1976). For this reason, the First Amendment requires that a compelling state interest be shown before a court may order disclosure of membership in an organization engaged in the advocacy of particular beliefs. *Tilton*, 869 S.W.2d at 956 (citing *NAACP*, 357 U.S. at 462-63, 78 S.Ct. 1163). "[I]t is immaterial whether the beliefs sought to be advanced by association pertain to political, economic, religious or cultural matters, and state action which may have the effect of curtailing the freedom to associate is subject to the closest scrutiny." *Id.*

Bay Area Citizens, 982 S.W.2d at 375-76 (footnote omitted). The court held that the party resisting disclosure bears the initial burden of making a *prima facie* showing that disclosure will burden First Amendment rights but noted that "the burden must be light." *Id.* at 376. Quoting the United State Supreme Court's decision in *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 74 (1976), the Texas court determined that the party resisting disclosure must show "a reasonable probability that the compelled disclosure of a party's contributors' names will subject them to threats, harassment, or reprisals from either Government officials or private parties." *Id.* Such proof may include "specific evidence of past or present harassment of members due to their associational ties, or of harassment directed against the organization itself." *Id.*

Having considered your arguments and the submitted information, we find that the disclosure of the identities of CASA's contributors will burden First Amendment rights of freedom of association. We believe the term "contributor" encompasses both the identities of those individuals and corporations who make financial donations to CASA and volunteers who donate their time and services to CASA. However, we note that the term "contributor" does not encompass members of CASA's governing board. *See generally* Gov't Code

¹Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision" and encompasses information made confidential by constitutional law or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.101. The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

§ 552.022(a)(2). In addition, *Bay Area Citizens* does not make confidential information pertaining to the donations themselves, such as the amount donated or types of donations. See *Bay Area Citizens*, 982 S.W.2d at 376-77 (only the names of contributors were at issue). Therefore, you must withhold the information that identifies contributors under section 552.101 pursuant to the right of association. We emphasize that the information must be withheld on this basis only to the extent reasonable and necessary to protect the identity of the contributor. The remaining submitted 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 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), (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 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 307859

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rick McDuffee
28239 Nancy Lane
Oak Ridge North, Texas 77385
(w/o enclosures)