



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 30, 2016

Ms. Akilah Mance
Counsel for the City of Hempstead
Olson & Olson LLP
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2016-26516

Dear Ms. Mance:

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# 635872 (Ref. COH 16-015).

The City of Hempstead (the "city"), which you represent, received three requests from the same requestor for all records pertaining to three named individuals during a specified time and all calls for service to a specified address during a specified time. You state the city will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ 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 you have redacted information from the submitted documents. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. Gov't Code § 552.301(a),

¹Section 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). 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).

(e)(1)(D). You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, you have been granted a previous determination to withhold such information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). In this instance, we are able to discern the nature of the information that has been redacted; thus, being deprived of that information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering the redacted information be released. *See id.* §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of “specific information requested”), .302. Thus, in the future, the city should refrain from redacting, without authorization, any information it submits to this office in seeking an open records ruling.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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. 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) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individuals. We find this request for unspecified law enforcement records implicates the named individuals’ rights to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note the city has submitted information that does not depict the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants. This information does not constitute a criminal history compilation protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld on that basis under section 552.101. Therefore, we will address your arguments against the disclosure of the information at issue.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See*

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the information at issue relates to closed cases that did not result in convictions or deferred adjudications. Based on your representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, we note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 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 information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201 of the Family Code provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Report number 20150783 consists of a report of alleged abuse or neglect made to the city's police department. However, we are unable to determine the age of the victim listed in the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of this section 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), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we must rule in the alternative. If the information at issue involves a victim who was a child at the time of the incident at issue, then the information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. In that instance, as you do not indicate the city has

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of the information at issue.

adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, the city must withhold report number 20150783 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). However, if the information at issue does not involve a victim of alleged abuse or neglect who was a child at the time of the incident at issue, then the information is not subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code and the city may not withhold the information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. In that instance, we will consider the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of report number 20150783.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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.³ *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. Additionally, in Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 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).

Upon review, we find the remaining information includes identifying information of a victim of sexual assault. Accordingly, the city must withhold the identity of the victim of sexual assault, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the public citizens' dates of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the remaining date of birth you seek to withhold relates to the individual whose identity is being withheld. Thus, this individual has been de-identified and her privacy interests are thus protected. Therefore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest.

³Section 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).

Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. If report number 20150783 involves a victim who was a child at the time of the incident at issue, then the city must withhold report number 20150783 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. If report number 20150783 does not involve a victim who was a child at the time of the incident at issue, then the city must (1) withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and (2) 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,



Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJC/akg

Ref: ID# 635872

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)