



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 22, 2015

Mr. Orlando "Jay" Juarez, Jr.
Counsel for the United Independent School District
J. Cruz & Associates, LLC
216 West Village Boulevard, Suite 202
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2015-26935

Dear Mr. Juarez:

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# 591973.

The United Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for (1) information pertaining to a specified grievance hearing, (2) information showing specific categories of information pertaining to grievances filed by parents during a specified time period, and (3) information showing specific categories of information pertaining to grievances filed by employees of the district during a specified time period. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 through 552.154 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim.

Initially, you state the district received the request for information on September 24, 2015. You explain you sent the requestor a cost estimate and request for a deposit for payment of these charges for providing some of the requested information. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.2615, .263(a). You assert the request for information was withdrawn by operation of law for failure to timely respond to the cost estimate for providing some of the requested records. However, upon review of a copy of the cost estimate, we find it does not comply with the requirements of section 552.2615(a) of the Government Code because it did not inform the requestor that inspection is an available less costly method of obtaining the requested information. *See id.* § 552.2615(a); *see also id.* § 552.263(a)(1). Accordingly, we conclude the request for information was not withdrawn by operation of law.

Next, we must address the district’s procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated 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. *See id.* § 552.301(e). The district received the request for information on September 24, 2015. However, as of the date of this letter, the district has not submitted for our review written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply or a copy or representative sample of the information requested. Consequently, we find the district 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 compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third-party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because the district has failed to comply with the procedural requirements of the Act, it has waived all of its claimed discretionary exceptions to disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions). Although the district also raises mandatory exceptions to disclosure, because the district has not submitted the requested information for our review, we have no basis for finding any of the information is excepted from disclosure or confidential by law. Thus, we have no choice but to order the district to release the requested information pursuant to section 552.302. If you believe the information is confidential and may not lawfully be released, you must challenge this ruling in court pursuant to section 552.324 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 "Cristian Rosas-Grillet". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/akg

Ref: ID# 591973

c: Requestor