



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 13, 2017

Mr. L. Brian Narvaez
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75801

OR2017-03221

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

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# 645519.

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. 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.

Initially, you state some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2015-22883 (2015). In that ruling, we determined the city must withhold the information at issue in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. You state there has been no change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must rely on Open Records Letter No. 2015-22883 as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that

information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the submitted information is not encompassed by the prior ruling, we will consider your arguments against its disclosure.

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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 58.007 of the Family Code. Section 58.007 provides, in relevant part:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), a “child” is a person who was ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Thus, under section 58.007, law enforcement records relating to a juvenile engaged in delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision on or after September 1, 1997 are confidential. *See id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision”). Upon review, we find the submitted information involves juveniles engaged in delinquent conduct on or after September 1, 1997. It does not appear that any of the exceptions to confidentiality under section 58.007 of the Family Code apply to this information. Thus, the submitted information is confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2015-22883, the city must rely that ruling as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. To the extent the remaining information at issue was not previously ruled upon, the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code.

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,



Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/sb

Ref: ID# 645519

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)