



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 1, 2017

Ms. Jo Ann Pate  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, Third Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2017-12011

Dear Ms. Pate:

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# 660436 (ORR# W059984).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all reports involving two named individuals, including a specified incident. We understand the city will redact certain criminal history record information pursuant to the previous determination issued to the city in Open Records Letter No. 2013-22304 (2013).<sup>1</sup> We also understand the city will redact dates of birth of members of the public pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter No. 2016-00620 (2016).<sup>2</sup> The city states it has released some of the requested information. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>Open Records Letter No. 2013-22304 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing it to withhold FBI numbers under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

<sup>2</sup>Open Records Letter No. 2016-00620 authorizes the city to withhold public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting an attorney general decision.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). The city received the request for information on March 13, 2017. The city does not inform us it was closed for any business days between March 13, 2017, and April 3, 2017. Accordingly, the city was required to provide the information required by section 552.301(e) by April 3, 2017. We note the city timely submitted some of the requested information. However, the envelope in which the city provided the remaining requested information as required by section 552.301(e) was postmarked April 4, 2017. *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). Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code with respect to the requested information that was not timely submitted.

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 that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (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). The city claims section 552.101 of the Government Code for the information at issue. Because section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the city's arguments under this exception against release of the submitted information. Further, section 552.130 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, we will address the applicability of section 552.130 to the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses 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.

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

*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. This office has found 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. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not a compilation of the individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov't Code* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Further, 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 id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system).

The present request seeks all reports pertaining to two named individuals. This request requires the city to compile the named individuals' criminal histories and implicates the named individuals' rights to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains unspecified law enforcement records listing either named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the city has submitted information that does not list either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. We also note the city has submitted documents relating to the incident specified by the requestor. This information does not consist of a compilation of the named individuals' criminal histories, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, which reads as follows:

(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), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Report numbers 13-47771, 13-69924, 14-18830, and 16-120090 involve juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03 (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of Fam. Code § 58.007). It does not appear any of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply. Therefore, the city must withhold report numbers 13-47771, 13-69924, 14-18830, and 16-120090 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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). Report numbers 15-95687 and 16-120100 were used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city’s police department (the “department”). *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this

section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. The city does not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information and therefore we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold report numbers 15-95687 and 16-120100 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.<sup>4</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

The city argues some of the remaining information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we agree most of the information the city marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We also find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, we find the city has not demonstrated some of the information it marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. This information, which we have marked for release, may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Therefore, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information it marked and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains unspecified law enforcement records listing either named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold report numbers 13-47771, 13-69924, 14-18830, and 16-120090 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. The city must withhold report numbers 15-95687

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of the submitted information.

and 16-120100 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information it marked and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>5</sup>

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](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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/nmd

Ref: ID# 660436

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>5</sup>The information being released contains social security numbers. 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 the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).