



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 4, 2016

Ms. Paige Mebane
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, Third Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-00119

Dear Ms. Mebane:

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# 592873 (Fort Worth PIR No. W046509).

The Fort Worth Police Department (the "department") received a request for all information relating to a specified case. The department states it has released some of the requested information. We understand the department will redact information pursuant to sections 552.130 and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the department claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."

¹We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law; and

(3) the identity of the person who made the report.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2), (3). Upon review, we find the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse. *See id.*

§§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201 as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1) (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Thus, the submitted information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. We note, however, the requestor is the legal representative of the parents of the child victims named in the submitted information and the parents are not alleged to have committed the suspected abuse. Therefore, the submitted information may not be withheld from the requestor under section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k).

Section 261.201(1)(3) provides that before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under section 261.201(k), the identity of the person who made the report of alleged child abuse or neglect must be redacted. *Id.* § 261.201(1)(3). However, in this case, the reporting party is the mother of the child victims, and is the requestor’s client. Thus, we find to construe section 261.201(1)(3) to require a governmental body to withhold the identifying information of a reporting party from a requestor with a section 261.201(k) right of access who represents the reporting party would lead to an absurd result that the legislature could not have intended. *See Hernandez v. Ebrom*, 289 S.W.3d 316, 318 (Tex. 2009) (unambiguous statutory language is interpreted according to its plain language unless such an interpretation would lead to absurd results); Attorney General Opinion GA-0876 (2011). Therefore, the department may not withhold the identity of the reporting party, which the department has marked, under section 552.101 on that ground. However, section 261.201(1)(2) states any information excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 261.201(1)(2). Accordingly, we will address whether any portion of the submitted information is otherwise excepted from disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 682. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy

interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.² *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. Upon review, we find the information the department has marked and we have marked satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information the department has marked and we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the information the department has marked and we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information.³

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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

²Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

³We note that because the requestor has a statutory right of access to the information being released in this instance, the department must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

Ref: ID# 592873

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)