



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 10, 2017

Ms. Linda Pemberton
Paralegal
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2017-05109

Dear Ms. Pemberton:

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# 648560 (Ref. No. W020987).

The Killeen Police Department (the "department") received a request for a specified police report. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the department has redacted portions of the submitted information. You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the department should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

We note the submitted information involves an alleged violation of section 32.51 of the Penal Code, which provides, “[a] person commits an offense if the person, with the intent to harm or defraud another, obtains, possesses, transfers, or uses an item of . . . identifying information of another person without the other person’s consent[.]” Penal Code § 32.51(b)(1). For purposes of section 32.51, “identifying information” includes an individual’s name and financial institution account number. *Id.* § 32.51(a)(1)(A), (C). Article 2.29 of the Code of Criminal Procedure pertains to alleged violations of section 32.51 that occurred on or after September 1, 2005, and provides:

(a) A peace officer to whom an alleged violation of Section 32.51, Penal Code, is reported shall make a written report to the law enforcement agency that employs the peace officer that includes the following information:

- (1) the name of the victim;
- (2) the name of the suspect, if known;
- (3) the type of identifying information obtained, possessed, transferred, or used in violation of Section 32.51, Penal Code; and
- (4) the results of any investigation.

(b) On the victim’s request, the law enforcement agency shall provide the report created under Subsection (a) to the victim. In providing the report, the law enforcement agency shall redact any otherwise confidential information that is included in the report, other than the information described by Subsection (a).

Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.29. For purposes of article 2.29, an offense is committed on or after September 1, 2005, if no “element of the offense occurs before that date.” Act of Jun. 17, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., ch. 294, § 1(b), 2005 Tex. Gen. Laws 885.

In this instance, the submitted information pertains to debit/credit card abuse, which constitutes an alleged violation of section 32.51. We note the requestor is the victim of the alleged identity theft listed in the report, and the alleged offense occurred after September 1, 2005. Therefore, the submitted information is subject to article 2.29 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.29. Although you seek to withhold some of the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, this exception does not make information confidential. Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 586 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.108). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, as section 552.101

of the Government Code makes information confidential, we will address the applicability of this section to 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 of the Government Code encompasses the common-law physical safety exception. The Texas Supreme Court has recognized, for the first time, a common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure. *Tex. Dep’t of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. & Hearst Newspapers, L.L.C.*, 343 S.W.3d 112, 118 (Tex. 2011). Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, “information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm.” *Id.* In applying this standard, the court noted “deference must be afforded” law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned, “vague assertions of risk will not carry the day.” *Id.* at 119. The department asserts some of the submitted information identifies a confidential informant for the department, and release of this information would jeopardize the safety of the informant. Based on the department’s representations and our review, we find the department must withhold the identifying information of the informant, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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. 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) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual’s criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note, however, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual’s current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.081(b).

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 *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. We note the requestor has a right of access to his own private information. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). We also note dates of birth pertaining to individuals who have been de-identified are not protected as the de-identifiable individuals' privacy interests are, thus, protected. Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked and all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the department has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception. The department must withhold the information we have marked and all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information.²

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/>

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).

²We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, the department must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

[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 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/bw

Ref: ID# 648560

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)