



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 29, 2017

Lieutenant Ricardo Gonzalez
Laredo Police Department
4712 Maher Avenue
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2017-19750

Dear Lt. Gonzalez:

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# 673205 (Internal Ref. No. W007667-060817).

The Laredo Police Department (the "department") received a request for all information pertaining to a specified accident involving the requestor's client. You state the department has released some information. We understand you have redacted some information pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information consists of a grand jury subpoena. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary, and therefore, not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury, and are also not

¹ Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact, without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office, the information described in section 552.136(b). Gov't Code § 552.136(c); *see also id.* § 552.136(d)-(e) (requestor may appeal governmental body's decision to withhold information under section 552.136(c) to attorney general and governmental body withholding information pursuant to section 552.136(c) must provide certain notice to requestor).

subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411, 398 (1983). Thus, to the extent the department holds the grand jury subpoena as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of a record of the judiciary that is not subject to disclosure under the Act. Therefore, the department is not required to release that information in response to the instant request.² To the extent the department does not hold the information at issue as an agent of the grand jury, we will consider the arguments against its disclosure.

Next, we must address the department's procedural obligations under section 552.301(b) 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(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). You state the department received the request for information on June 7, 2017. You do not inform us the department was closed for any business days between June 7, 2017, and June 21, 2017. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by June 21, 2017. However, the envelope in which the department provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was postmarked June 22, 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 department failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(b).

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, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The need of a governmental body, other than the governmental body that failed to timely seek an open records decision, to withhold information under section 552.108 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 586 (1991), 469 (1987) (university may withhold information under Gov't Code § 552.103 predecessor to protect district attorney's interest in anticipated criminal litigation). Because you inform us, and provide documentation showing, the Webb County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") objects to the release of the information at issue, we will consider whether the department may withhold the submitted information under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. Additionally, as sections 552.101 and 552.130 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will also address

²In this instance, as we are able to make this determination, we need not address the submitted arguments against disclosure of this information.

the applicability of these sections for the information at issue.³ However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address the exception you raise.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(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.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

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

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law[.]

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we find the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation by the department of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261. *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 within the scope of section 261.201. However, we note the requestor’s client, who is not alleged to have committed the alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect, may be a parent of the child victim. *See id.* § 261.201(k). Thus, we must rule conditionally. If the requestor’s client is not a parent of the child victim, the department must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.⁴ If the requestor’s client is a parent of the child victim, the department may not withhold the information at issue from the requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201(a). *See id.* We note section 261.201(l)(2) states any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Thus, to the extent the requestor’s client is a parent of the child victim, we will consider the arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

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). Generally, 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). We note the information at issue includes a DIC-24 statutory warning and a DIC-25 notice of suspension. Because the department provided copies of these forms to the arrestee, we find their release will not interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Therefore, the department may not withhold the DIC-24 statutory warning or the DIC-25 notice of suspension under section 552.108(a)(1). The district attorney’s office objects to the release of the remaining information because it pertains to a pending criminal investigation and prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the remaining information 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ.

⁴In this instance, as our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure.

App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559, 560-61 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information.

However, section 552.108(a)(1) 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 186-87; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of the basic information, the DIC-24 statutory warning, and the DIC-25 notice of suspension, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.⁵

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

We note the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information related to litigation through the discovery process. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, any information obtained from or provided to all other parties in the anticipated or pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. The submitted DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms were provided to the arrestee; thus, the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms were inevitably seen by the opposing party to the litigation. Furthermore, basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991). Therefore, the department may not withhold the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms or basic information on behalf of the district attorney's office under section 552.103.

We note portions of the submitted DIC-24 statutory warning and DIC-25 notice of suspension are subject to sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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 Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). Thus, the department must withhold the public citizen's date of birth we have 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 department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the department holds the grand jury subpoena as an agent of the grand jury, pursuant to section 552.003 of the Government Code, the department is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. If the requestor's client is not a parent of the child victim, the department must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. If the requestor's client is a parent of the child victim, then with the exception of the basic information, the DIC-24 statutory warning, and the DIC-25 notice of suspension, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. In releasing the DIC-24 statutory warning and DIC-25 notice of suspension, the department must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, as well as the motor vehicle

record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must release the basic information and the remaining information within the submitted DIC-24 statutory warning and the DIC-25 notice of suspension.

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,



Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/sb

Ref: ID# 673205

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)