



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 28, 2016

Mr. Jonathan T. Koury
Assistant City Attorney
City of Bryan
P.O. Box 1000
Bryan, Texas 77805-1000

OR2016-06862

Dear Mr. Koury:

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# 603104.

The City of Bryan (the "city") received a request for all calls made to a specified address involving a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim 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." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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.¹ *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. Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the information we marked, and all public citizens' dates of birth you have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information it marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You also seek to withhold some information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). Additionally, the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer's privilege does not protect the public employee's identity. *Cf. United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660, 665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform).

¹Section 552.102(a) exempts 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).

You assert some of the information you have marked reveals the identities of complainants who reported possible violations of state law and city ordinances that carry criminal penalties to police officers of the city's police department, who are authorized to enforce the laws and ordinances at issue. There is no indication the subject of the complaints knows the identities of the complainants. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude some of the information you have marked identifies the complainants; thus, the city may generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information it marked reveals the identity of a complainant who reported possible violations of state law or city ordinances to police officers of the city's police department, who are authorized to enforce the laws and ordinances at issue. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with informer's privilege.

The request indicates the requestor may be a representative of a child-placing agency that is licensed by the Texas Department of Family Protective Services ("DFPS") in accordance with chapter 42 of the Human Resources Code, and the individual whose information is requested is a prospective foster parent. *See generally* Hum. Res. Code ch. 42. Pursuant to rules promulgated by DFPS under chapter 42 of the Human Resources Code, child-placing agencies are required to complete a foster home screening prior to verifying a foster home. *See id.* § 42.042(a), (e), (f)-(g) (DFPS shall make rules to carry out provisions of chapter 42, including minimum standards for child-placing agencies, child-care services, licensed child-care facilities, and registered family homes). As part of the screening, the agency must obtain certain information as set forth at section 749.2447, 40 T.A.C. §§ 749.2445(c)(1)..2471(1); *cf.* Hum. Res. Code § 42.0561 (providing in part that "[b]efore . . . a child-placing agency may issue a verification certificate for an agency foster home, the . . . child-placing agency must obtain information relating to each family violence report at the applicant's residence to which a law enforcement agency responded during the 12 months preceding the date of the application. The applicant shall provide the information on a form prescribed by the department."). Section 749.2447(7) provides a child-placing agency must obtain, document, and assess, in part, the following information about a prospective foster home:

The results of criminal history and central registry background checks conducted on the prospective foster parents[.] . . . With respect to law enforcement service call information, [the child-placing agency] must do the following:

- (A) Obtain service call information from the appropriate law enforcement agency for the prospective foster parents' addresses for the past two years. Discuss with the prospective foster parents any service call information that [the

child-placing agency] obtain[s] from a law enforcement agency and the facts surrounding the incident.

...

(C) Assess and document information obtained from law enforcement and any discussion with the prospective foster parents in the foster home screening.

40 T.A.C § 749.2447(7)(A), (C) (emphasis added); *see id.* § 749.2445(a); *see also id.* §§ 745.21(8) (defining “child-placing agency”), (32) (defining “permit”), (33) (defining “permit holder”), 749.41(1) (defining “you” as applicant or permit holder), .43 (words and terms in chapter 749 have meanings assigned under section 745.21). Thus, section 749.2447(7) of title 40 of the Texas Administrative Code requires a child-placing agency to obtain all service call information for a two year period for service calls to the addresses of prospective foster parents from appropriate law enforcement agencies. *See id.* § 749.2447(7)(A), (C). Accordingly, we find a child-placing agency licensed by DFPS under chapter 42 of the Human Resources Code has a right of access to this information under section 749.2447(7) when it is obtained for the purpose of verifying a prospective foster home pursuant to the requirements of section 749.2445.

In this instance, the requestor is seeking calls involving a prospective foster parent at her residence and the submitted information is within the previous two years. Accordingly, we conclude the requestor may have a right of access to the submitted information pursuant to section 749.2447(7) of title 40 of the Texas Administrative Code. Although you seek to withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer’s privilege and common-law privacy, a specific statutory right of access prevails over the common law. *See Collins v. Tex Mall, L.P.*, 297 S. W.3d 409, 415 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2009, no pet.) (statutory provision controls and preempts common law only when statute directly conflicts with common-law principle); *CenterPoint Energy Houston Elec. LLC v. Harris County Toll Rd.*, 436 F.3d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 2006) (common law controls only where there is no conflicting or controlling statutory law).

Consequently, if the requestor is a representative of a child-placing agency that is licensed by DFPS in accordance with chapter 42 of the Human Resources Code, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy or the informer’s privilege. However, if the requestor is not such a representative, then the city must withhold the information we marked and the dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer’s privilege. 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, 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ashley Crutchfield".

Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/dls

Ref: ID# 603104

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)