



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 24, 2015

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
Office of the City Attorney
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2015-12441

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 568331 (COSA File No. W072692).

The City of San Antonio and the San Antonio Police Department (collectively, the "city") received two requests for photographs related to a specified case. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. 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* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You state the city received the requests for information on March 27, 2015. You do not inform us the city was closed for any business days between March 27, 2015, and April 10, 2015. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by April 10, 2015. However, your request for ruling was sent to this office in an envelope that was meter-marked April 13, 2015. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we

conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

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 requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *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); *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* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108). Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, section 552.130 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness.¹ Therefore, we will address the applicability of section 552.130 to the submitted information.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the remaining information.

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/>

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

[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 "N. A. Ybarra". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "N" and a stylized "Ybarra".

Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/cbz

Ref: ID# 568331

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)