



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 21, 2016

Ms. Bobbi Kacz
Office of the City Attorney
City of Alvin
216 West Sealy Street
Alvin, Texas 77511

OR2016-28176

Dear Ms. Kacz:

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# 638990 (Ref. No. CA-16-0064).

The City of Alvin (the "city") received a request for all incident reports concerning sexual assaults during a specified period that were deemed unfounded. You state you will redact certain information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 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 representative sample of information.²

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsections 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 without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

²We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we must address the city's procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), within ten business days after receiving a written request the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The city received the request for information on September 20, 2016. You state the city offices are closed for business on Fridays. You explain the city provided the requestor with a cost estimate pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code on September 22, 2016, and received a response accepting the charges on September 26, 2016. However, we note section 552.2615 provides the submission of an estimate of charges to the requestor does not affect the governmental body's deadlines to ask for an attorney general decision under section 552.301. *See id.* § 552.2615(g) (providing "[t]he time deadlines imposed by this section do not affect the application of a time deadline imposed on a governmental body under Subchapter G"). Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was October 6, 2016. However, the city submitted the request for decision required under section 552.301(b) in an envelope bearing a post-office meter mark of October 11, 2016. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the submitted information is public and must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). This statutory presumption can generally be overcome when information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Although you raise section 552.108 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108. However, you also assert the submitted information is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code, which makes information confidential. Because the city's claim under section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure, we will address the city's argument under this exception.

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 § 52.101. This section encompasses section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

[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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You state some of the submitted information was used in investigations of alleged child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201 of Family Code). Thus, this information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city does not indicate its police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such rule exists. Given that assumption, the city must withhold this information, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.³ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

You assert portions of the remaining information are confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right to privacy, which protects information if it (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 met. *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 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. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983);

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for this information.

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). 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.⁴ *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 some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate concern to the public, or it pertains to individuals who have been de-identified and whose privacy interests are, thus, protected. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

As noted above, you state you are redacting some information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code. We note the remaining information contains additional motor vehicle record information. Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See Gov't Code* § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the additional motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.


In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the additional motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

⁴Section 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).

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 black ink, appearing to read "Emily Kunst", written in a cursive style.

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/akg

Ref: ID# 638990

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)