



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 25, 2017

Mr. James Kopp  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of San Antonio  
P.O. Box 839966  
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2017-21965

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 683257 (COSA No. W178210).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named city employee's suspension. You state the city will release some information. 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 representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the city, failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code. 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 Gov't Code* § 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

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume 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.

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 No. 586 (1991). Because you inform us the Bexar County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") objects to the release of the information at issue, we will consider whether the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. Further, sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, we will consider the applicability of these sections to the submitted information.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

(18) a settlement agreement to which a governmental body is a party.

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17)-(18). The submitted information contains court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17) and a settlement agreement that is subject to section 552.022(a)(18). This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The district attorney's office seeks to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, section 552.108 is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code and must be released. However, we note portions of the information at issue is subject to section 552.130, which

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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).

makes information confidential under the Act. Therefore, we will address the applicability of section 552.130 to the information subject to section 552.022.<sup>3</sup>

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 district attorney’s office states the remaining information pertains to a pending criminal prosecution. We note, however, the remaining information includes a DIC-24 Statutory Warning and a DIC-25 Notice of Suspension. Copies of these forms were provided to the arrestee. We find the district attorney’s office has not explained releasing this information, which has already been provided to the arrestee, would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Accordingly, the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms may not be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). However, based on the district attorney’s office’s representation and our review, 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 77 (Tex. Civ. 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 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information.

However, section 552.108 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; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, and basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office.

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 submitted motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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. *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. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *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.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>4</sup> *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens’ dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3. In releasing the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms and basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth in the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.<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/>


---

<sup>4</sup>Section 552.102(a) exempts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a).

<sup>5</sup>We note basic information includes an arrestee’s social security number. 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 requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

[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,



Jennifer Copeland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JC/sb

Ref: ID# 683257

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)