



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 26, 2017

Mr. Oscar Gabaldón, Jr.
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2017-16836

Dear Mr. Gabaldón:

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# 668073 (City's Case 17-1026-8487).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident and the officers involved in the incident.¹ You state you will release some of the information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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.

¹The city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified). You inform us 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. You inform us the city received full payment on May 9, 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).

Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Report number 17061159 consists of information used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Accordingly, this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for the purposes of this section as a 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) (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). As we have no indication the city has adopted a rule governing the release of this type of information, we assume that no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, and based on our review, we conclude report number 17061159 is confidential pursuant to section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007. *Id.* § 58.007(c). The relevant language of section 58.007 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:

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(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.

Id. 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). The remaining information includes a police report that involves conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision”). Thus, this information is subject to section 58.007(c). In this instance, it does not appear any of the exceptions to confidentiality under section 58.007 apply. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code.³ However, the remaining information at issue consists of internal affairs investigation records that do not constitute juvenile law enforcement records for purposes of section 58.007(c). Accordingly, the remaining information is not confidential under section 58.007(c) and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

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 the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The city states the remaining information relates to an ongoing criminal prosecution. Upon review, we conclude the release of the information at issue would 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 present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.108, however, 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; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁴

We understand you to claim some of the basic information is subject to the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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). Upon review, we find some of the basic information contains identifying information of a sexual assault victim. This information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, in releasing basic information, the city must withhold the identity of the victim in the reports we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold report number 17061159 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family 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. In releasing basic information, the city must withhold the identity of the victim in the reports we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure, except to note basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

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,



Sidney M. Pounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SMP/sdk

Ref: ID# 668703

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)