



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 27, 2017

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman
Counsel for the City of Melissa
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2017-04184

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 647395.

The City of Melissa (the "city"), which you represent, received three requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified incident.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.1085, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor asks the city to answer questions. The Act does not require a governmental body to answer factual questions, conduct legal research, or create new information in responding to a request. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990). However, a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to any responsive information that is within its possession or control. Open Records Decision Nos. 561 at 8-9 (1990), 555 at 102. We assume you have made a good-faith effort to do so.

¹We note the city sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code, and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615.

Next, we note the submitted information includes court-filed documents, which are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(17) provides for the required public disclosure of “information that is also contained in a public court record” unless it is “made confidential under [the Act] or other law[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you raise section 552.108 of the Government Code, this is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). As such, section 552.108 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the court-filed documents may not be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. You also seek to withhold the court-filed documents under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992). Therefore, no portion of the court-filed documents may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure for the court-filed documents, the city must release these documents. However, we will consider the arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . 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 explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state, and provide documentation showing, the submitted information relates to a criminal case that resulted in a conviction, but the defendant has filed notice of appeal. Based upon your representation and our review, we conclude release of the information at issue will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information.

However, we note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 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). We note basic information includes, among other items, a detailed description of the offense. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. However, the basic information does not include public citizens’ dates of birth or motor vehicle record information encompassed by section 552.130

of the Government Code. *See id.* Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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 (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). 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 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). However, the common-law right to privacy is a personal right that “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy interest is invaded[.]” *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Upon review, we find we find the city has not demonstrated any of the basic information is information pertaining to a living individual that is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the basic information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must release the submitted court-filed documents pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government 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.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information. We note basic information includes an arrestee’s social security number. 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 requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

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 "Matthew Taylor".

Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/bw

Ref: ID# 647385

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)