



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 12, 2015

Mr. Richard Bilbie
City Attorney
City of Harlingen
P.O. Box 2207
Harlingen, Texas 78551

OR2015-23785

Dear Mr. Bilbie:

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# 586859.

The Harlingen Police Department (the "department") received a request for nine categories of information pertaining to the investigation surrounding, and the individuals involved in, a car accident involving the requestor's client. The department states some information does not exist.¹ The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the department claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988)*. This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of “information that is also contained in a public court record[.]” unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although the department claims sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body’s interests and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Furthermore, although the department claims the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) is protected by common-law privacy, we note information that has been filed with a court is not protected by common-law privacy. *See Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (common-law privacy not applicable to court-filed document). Therefore, the department may not withhold the court-filed documents, which we have marked, under section 552.103 or section 552.108 of the Government Code or common-law privacy. As the department has not claimed any other exceptions to disclosure for the court-filed documents, the department must release those documents.

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 . . . 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(a)(1) 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). The department states the remaining information relates to an active criminal investigation and release of the information would interfere with that investigation. *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). Based on these representations and our review, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code is applicable to the information at issue.

However, 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). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic front-page offense and arrest

information, the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

Next, we understand the department to claim the basic information is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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. Section 552.101 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual’s privacy. Although the department asserts the basic information is confidential in its entirety pursuant to common-law privacy, we find this is not a situation where all of this information must be withheld to protect any individual’s privacy interest. Furthermore, upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any portion of the basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the department may not withhold the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, the department must release the marked court-filed documents.⁴ With the exception of basic information, which must also be released, the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) 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.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note basic information is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

⁴We note the requestor has a right of access to some information being released pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. See Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“[a] person or a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves).

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,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 586859

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)