



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2015

Ms. Captoria Brown  
Paralegal  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Carrollton  
1945 East Jackson Road  
Carrollton, Texas 75006

OR2015-06196

Dear Ms. Brown:

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# 558427 (City ID No. 4221).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for all complaints, offense reports, and municipal court records over a specified time period that relate to any of three named individuals at specified addresses. You state some information has been released to the requestor. We understand the city will redact information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the requested information may have been the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2015-03968 (2015). In Open Records Letter No. 2015-03968, we concluded the city may withhold certain information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

must withhold certain motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. We have no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information at issue in Open Records Letter No. 2015-03968, the city may continue to rely on the previous ruling as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure). We will address your arguments against disclosure of the information not subject to Open Records Letter No. 2015-03968.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. A compilation of an individual’s criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual’s criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request seeks unspecified reports pertaining to named individuals. This request requires the city to compile the named individuals’ criminal history and implicates the rights of privacy of the named individuals. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing any of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note, however, you have submitted reports that do not list any of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information is not part of a criminal history compilation and, thus, does not implicate the individuals’ rights to privacy. As such, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. Accordingly, we will address your arguments for this information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the information at issue relates to pending prosecutions. Based on this representation and our review, we find release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, as you acknowledge, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S. W.2d at 186-187; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note the information at issue consists of call sheets. In Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996), this office concluded information contained in a computer-assisted dispatch (“CAD”) report is substantially the same as basic information. *See* ORD 649 at 3; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 394 at 3 (1983) (there is no qualitative difference between information contained in radio cards or radio logs and front-page offense report information expressly held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*; thus, such information is generally public). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold call sheet numbers 2013059559 and 2014069535 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.


We note a portion of the remaining information is subject to common-law privacy. As previously discussed, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked in the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing any of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold call sheet numbers 2013059559 and 2014069535 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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,



Joseph Behnke  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 558427

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)