Vendor cybertheft: ruling and delivery

June 30 ruling; September 16-17, 2026 correspondence

The ruling is reproduced on pages 2-3. The following reading copies preserve the selected message text, with signatures/contact blocks and repeated quoted history omitted. They do not include the 517-page production or its embedded attachments. Receipt and completeness are separate issues.

September 17 reply attribution: the message was sent from Lea Ream's email address, but its text is signed by Marla Dial, Paralegal.

KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 30, 2026

Mr. Austin R. Beck
Counsel for the City of Mount Pleasant
Davidson Troilo Ream Garza
601 North West Loop 410 Suite 100
San Antonio, Texas 78216

OR2026-027532

Dear Mr. Beck:

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# 26-020929.

The City of Mount Pleasant (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a specified incident. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

We must address the city's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See id.* § 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)(1)(A)-(D). In this instance, you state the city received the request for information on April 9, 2026. As of the date of this letter, you have not submitted for our review a copy or representative sample of the information requested**.** Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of 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 city raises exceptions to disclosure, because you have 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. If you believe the 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 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,

Garon Hunt
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GH/tb

Ref: ID# 26-020929

c: Requestor

September 16, 2026 | Austin Beck to Kyle Moring; Bailey, Ream and Webster copied

Attached please find all responsive information for your pending open records request per OR2026-027532. Please be advised that certain access device numbers have been redacted pursuant to Sec. 552.136, Tex. Gov’t Code.

This is PART ONE OF THREE that will be sent to you in three separate emails due to file size.

September 17, 2026 | Kyle Moring to Austin Beck; Bailey, Ream and Webster copied

Mr. Beck,

I confirm receipt of the following five production PDFs transmitted on September 16:

1. Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 1 of Part 1 of 3.pdf – 85 pages. 2. Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 2 of Part 1 of 3.pdf – 90 pages. 3. Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 2 of 3.pdf – 150 pages. 4. Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 1 of Part 3 of 3.pdf – 97 pages. 5. Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 2 of Part 3 of 3.pdf – 95 pages.

These total 517 PDF pages, not counting the contents of files embedded as attachments within those PDFs.

I did not receive the attachment identified as “Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 1 of 3.pdf” in the initial PART 1/3 transmission. Please confirm that the two split Part 1 files replace that attachment and together contain its complete contents. Please likewise confirm that the two split Part 3 files contain the complete contents of the original Part 3, and that splitting preserved all embedded attachments.

Please also confirm the intended reading order. Some correspondence continues across file boundaries that do not follow the filenames’ apparent sequence. For example, the last page of “Part 2 of Part 3 of 3” ends with “to assist you with,” and the first page of “Part 1 of Part 3 of 3” continues “some of the facts and background.”

Upon further review, I located and extracted documents embedded as attachments within the production PDFs. I am therefore not asserting that those documents were omitted merely because their contents do not appear as printed pages.

Please confirm whether these five PDFs, together with their embedded attachments, constitute the City’s complete production under my April 9, 2026 request and OAG Letter Ruling OR2026-027532, or identify any additional files already transmitted or still forthcoming.

This correspondence seeks clarification of the existing production; it does not withdraw, replace, or expand my request. My acknowledgment of receipt does not constitute agreement that the production fully satisfies the request or ruling. Please continue to preserve the underlying source emails, attachments, and associated metadata.

Mr. Bailey, please include this receipt and completeness update in the record of my pending Section 552.3215 complaint.

Respectfully,

Kyle Douglas Moring

September 17, 2026 | Reply signed by Marla Dial, sent from Lea Ream’s address

Mr. Moring: Mr. Beck today is traveling on business, but perhaps I can assist.

1. I can confirm that 517 pages is the correct total you should have received. 2. I believe the suggested reading order is as follows: * Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 1 of Part 1 of 3.pdf – 85 pages. * Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 2 of Part 1 of 3.pdf – 90 pages. * Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 2 of 3.pdf – 150 pages. * Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 1 of Part 3 of 3.pdf – 97 pages. * Moring Resp Info - Redacted - Part 2 of Part 3 of 3.pdf – 95 pages. Since the responsive documents were originally in a single PDF that was too big to travel through email, the smaller pieces should have the complete contents of the original Part 1 and Part 3 that you mentioned. I defer to Mr. Beck on any remaining questions you may have about his messages yesterday, once he is able to return to his email. No further response to me on this matter is necessary, but I hope that the above is helpful.