



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 10, 2014

Ms. Josette Flores
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950

OR2014-04073

Dear Ms. Flores:

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# 516026.

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for a specified animal services complaint number. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, are not responsive to the instant request because they pertain to different animal services complaint numbers. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city need not release it in response to this request.

Next, we note the city has redacted information from the responsive documents. We understand the city has redacted some motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ However, the city has also redacted a date of

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. See Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). See *id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

birth from the responsive documents. You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, the city has been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the city should refrain from redacting any information it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

As you acknowledge, the city has not complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Governmental Code in requesting this ruling. *See id.* § 552.301(b), (e). 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 information is public and must be released, unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (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. 319 (1982). This office has held that a compelling reason exists to withhold information when the information is confidential by law or affects third party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). You seek to withhold portions of the responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The purpose of the common-law informer's privilege is to protect the flow of information to a governmental body, rather than to protect a third person. Thus, the informer's privilege, unlike other claims under section 552.101, may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 6 (1990). Therefore, the city's assertion of the informer's privilege does not provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302, and the city may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.101 on that basis. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, the responsive information must be released in its entirety.

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 cursive script, appearing to read "Lee Seidlits".

Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/tch

Ref: ID# 516026

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)