



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 10, 2017

Ms. Stacie S. White
Counsel for the City of Benbrook
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2017-18150

Dear Ms. White:

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# 670166.

The City of Benbrook (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified address and a named individual during a specified time period. You state the city will redact certain motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created before the time period specified in the request. The city need not release nonresponsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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 that a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

You assert the present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the individual at issue. However, we note the responsive information does not depict the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or a criminal defendant. This information does not constitute a criminal history compilation protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld on that basis under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides 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). You generally state the responsive information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged child abuse or neglect. Upon review, we find the information we have marked is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Family Code ch. 261); *see also 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). As you do not indicate the city’s police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such rule exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold the information we have marked in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (addressing predecessor statute). However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining responsive information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(2). Furthermore, you have not established the remaining responsive information is a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under section 261.201(a)(1). Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. 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.).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked and the public citizens’ dates of birth satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked and the public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 reasonably 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 “the responsive materials include information relating to incidents for which investigation [or] prosecution is currently pending[.]” We note the city submitted reports pertaining to several separate incidents. However, you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue pertains to any specific ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, nor have you explained how its release would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of a particular crime. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) to any of the information at issue, and the city may not withhold the remaining responsive information on that basis.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.² Section 552.136 states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136; *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the bank account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked 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 and the public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the bank account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining responsive information must be released.


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

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 that reads "Jennifer Copeland". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

Jennifer Copeland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JC/sb

Ref: ID# 670166

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)