



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 27, 2016

Ms. P. Armstrong  
Assistant City Attorney  
Criminal Law and Police Section  
City of Dallas  
1400 South Lamar  
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2016-01990

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

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# 595603 (ORR# 2015-18204).

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident report. We understand the department is withholding information pursuant to sections 552.130 and 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> The department claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<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. 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 under the Act. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

<sup>2</sup>We 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 contains court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, which provides the following:

Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although the department asserts the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108, this section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Although the department also asserts the identifying information of a victim of alleged sexual assault in these documents is confidential under common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground, we note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public records. *See Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Thus, the department may not withhold any portion of the court-filed documents under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy or under section 552.108 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. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally only information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual

harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). The department seeks to withhold the remaining information in its entirety under common-law privacy because the information pertains to a sexual assault investigation, and the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. However, the submitted information reveals the alleged victim filed a lawsuit against the requestor and another individual regarding the alleged sexual assault, and the alleged victim's identity was not withheld from documents filed in that litigation. Upon review, we conclude the alleged victim has waived her own right to privacy by filing a lawsuit against the suspects. *See Cox Broad.*, 420 U.S. at 496 (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star Telegram*, 834 S.W.2d at 57 (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 on that ground.

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. *Id.* 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.<sup>3</sup> *Tex. 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. The requestor has a right of access to his own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). However, the department must withhold the remaining dates of birth in the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

The department asserts some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(a) of the Government Code, which 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(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.*

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 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).


§§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). The department states the remaining information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(1) relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of this information 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, the department may withhold the remaining information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

To conclude, with the exception of the information we have marked under section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, which the department must release, the department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the department must withhold the dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information.<sup>4</sup>

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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/bhf

---

<sup>4</sup>Because the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released, the department must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

Ref: ID# 595603

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)