



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 26, 2018

Ms. Jo Ann Pate
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2018-04418

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# 697237 (PIR No. W067333).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for four categories of information, including the criminal record history of a named individual and a report of how many times police have been called to the named individual's address. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, you state some of the responsive information was the subject of previous requests for information in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2017-05896 (2017), 2017-08752 (2017), and 2017-12011 (2017). Additionally, we note some of the responsive information was the subject of a previous request in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2017-19511 (2017). Accordingly, we conclude the city must

¹We 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2017-19511 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with this ruling. To the extent the remaining responsive information was the subject of previous rulings, the city must dispose of any such information in accordance with those rulings, provided there has been no change in the law, facts, and circumstances on which the previous rulings were based. To the extent the remaining responsive information is not the subject of a previous ruling, the underlying law, facts, and circumstances of which have not changed, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (listing elements of first type of previous determination under Gov't Code § 552.301(a)).

Next, we note the city has not submitted information related to the second category of requested information. We assume, to the extent any information responsive to the second category of requested information and not covered by a previous determination existed on the date the city received the request, the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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. 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. 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 a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual. We find this request for unspecified law enforcement records implicates the named individual's right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not private and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. We note you have submitted

information that does not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not constitute part of a criminal history compilation and may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records concerning a child and information concerning a child that are stored by electronic means or otherwise and from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as adult records, accessible only under controls that are separate and distinct from the 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 Subsection (c) or Subchapter B, D, or E.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See id.* § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). You argue some of the remaining information is subject to section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. Upon review, we find the information at issue does not identify a juvenile as a suspect, offender, or defendant. Therefore, we find that the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 58.008 to the remaining information, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code. Section 261.201 provides, in relevant 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.

Id. § 261.201(a). You argue the some of the remaining information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *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). However, upon review, we find the city failed to demonstrate the information at issue involves a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect of a child made under chapter 261 of the Family Code, or that this information was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261. Accordingly, we conclude the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on this basis.

As stated above, 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2017-19511 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with this ruling. To the extent the responsive information was the subject of Open Records Letter Nos. 2017-05896, 2017-08752, or 2017-12011, the city must dispose of any such information in accordance with those rulings, provided there has been no change in the law, facts, and circumstances on which the previous rulings were based. To the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KSM/sb

Ref: ID# 697237

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)