



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 14, 2020

Mr. Albert E. Tovar  
Counsel for the Harlandale Independent School District  
Sanchez & Wilson, PLLC  
6243 IH-10 West, Suite 1025  
San Antonio, Texas 78201

OR2020-01277

Dear Mr. Tovar:

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# 806158 (ORR# 6659).

The Harlandale Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for personnel records pertaining to a named employee and communications between named individuals.<sup>1</sup> We understand you do not have information responsive to portions of the request.<sup>2</sup> You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 through 552.158 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim.

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup> The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

We must address the district's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. 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). The district states it received the request for information on September 18, 2019. Further, you provide documentation showing the district sought clarification on October 2, 2019 and received clarification on October 15, 2019. *See id.* § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used.) Thus, the district is deemed to have received the request on October 15, 2019. However, as of this date, the district has not submitted to this office written comments stating the reasons why your claimed exceptions apply, or a copy or representative sample of the information requested. Consequently, we conclude the district 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, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Although the district raises exceptions to disclosure, because it has not submitted the requested information for our review, we have no basis for finding any of the information excepted from disclosure. Thus, we have no choice but to order the requested information released pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code. If you believe this information 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

Mr. Albert E. Tovar - Page 3

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "D. Michelle Case" followed by a long, sweeping horizontal flourish.

D. Michelle Case  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DMC/mo

Ref: ID# 806158

c: Requestor