



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 3, 2017

Ms. Ann-Marie Sheely
Assistant County Attorney
Travis County District Attorney's Office
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2017-06841

Dear Ms. Sheely:

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# 652287.

The Travis County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for information pertaining to three specified cause numbers involving a named individual.¹ You state you have no information responsive to a portion of the request.² You

¹You state the district attorney's office sought and received clarification of the request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed). We note you sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. See *id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the district attorney's office received the required deposit on January 18, 2017. See *id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

²The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

state you will release some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.1325 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.).

Most of the submitted information pertains to a report of alleged sexual assault. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally, only information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *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); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). The requestor in this case represents the suspect listed in the sexual assault report and knows the identity of the alleged victim. We believe in this instance, withholding only identifying information from the requestor would not preserve the victim’s common-law right to privacy. Therefore, we conclude the district attorney’s office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.⁴ Upon review, we also find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the district attorney’s office must withhold all public citizens’ dates

³We 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.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of the information at issue.


of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district attorney's office must release the remaining information.⁵

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,



Kaelan A. Henze
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAH/eb

Ref: ID# 652287

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁵We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the district attorney's office receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the district attorney's office must again seek a decision from this office.