



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 20, 2014

Ms. Suzanne West
City Attorney
City of Del Rio
109 West Broadway Street
Del Rio, Texas 78840

OR2014-21128

Dear Ms. West:

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# 545279.

The City of Del Rio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted 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 the city has redacted a portion of the submitted information. You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have 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

¹Although you do not explicitly raise sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code, we understand you to raise these exceptions based on the substance of your arguments. Although you raise common-law privacy for the submitted information, you provide no argument explaining how this doctrine is applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert this doctrine. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

ruling. In the future, however, the city should refrain from redacting any information that 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.

Next, we must address the city's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request: (1) written comments stating the reasons why the claimed 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. *Id.* § 552.301(e). In this instance, you state the city received the request for information on August 27, 2014. We understand the city was closed on September 1, 2014. We note this office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadline under the Act. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was September 11, 2014, and the city's fifteen-business-day deadline under section 552.301(e) was September 18, 2014. However, the envelope in which you submitted the information under section 552.301 bears a post meter mark of September 24, 2014. *See id.* § 552.308(a) (prescribing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we find the city 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. The city claims section 552.108 of the Government Code for the submitted information. However, this exception is discretionary in nature. It serves to protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived; as such, it does not constitute a compelling reason to withhold information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.)

(governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. The city also seeks to withhold the submitted 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 submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. However, because your other claim under section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure, we will consider the applicability of this exception to 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."² Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code are applicable to emergency 9-1-1 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These sections make the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.118 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than two million. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 860,000. Section 772.318 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000.

You do not indicate whether the submitted information includes originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier. We note you do not inform us whether the city is part of an emergency communication district established under section 772.118, section 772.218, or section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 on the basis of section 772.118, section 772.218, or section 772.318. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released.

²Although you cite Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996), we understand you to assert some of the submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 772.118, 772.218, or 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code in conjunction with section 552.101 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 "Paige Thompson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/dls

Ref: ID# 545279

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)