



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 16, 2019

Ms. Marie Balthrop
City Clerk
City of Wichita Falls
P.O. Box 1431
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307

OR2019-10190

Dear Ms. Balthrop:

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# 760076 (ORR# 62).

The City of Wichita Falls (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified address and named individuals. The city claims the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the procedural obligations of the city under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. 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. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The city informs us it received the request for information on January 17, 2019. The city states it sought and received clarification of the information requested, which it received on that same day. *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). We understand the city was closed on January 21, 2019. Thus, the city's ten-business-day deadline to

request a ruling was February 1, 2019. The envelope in which the city provided the information required by section 552.301(b) has two postmarks: the first dated January 30, 2019, and the second dated February 7, 2019. *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). Because one of the postmarks is dated after the 10-business-day deadline prescribed by section 552.301(b), we are unable to determine whether the city timely requested a ruling. Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(b) 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 id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of this section to the information at issue. However, we find the city has failed to establish a compelling reason to address section 552.108 of the Government Code.

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 requestor asks, in part, for all information held by the city concerning two named individuals. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement information depicting either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has submitted documents that do not list either named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Thus, this information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

[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 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). Upon review, we find incident report number 17-061070 was used or developed in an investigation by the city's police department (the "department") under chapter 261. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1) (defining "abuse" for purposes of section 261.201). Thus, the information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city does not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such rule exists. Given that assumption, the city must withhold incident report number 17-061070 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) (predecessor statute).*


In summary, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement information depicting either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold incident report number 17-061070 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.¹

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.

¹Although the requestor is a representative of the Oklahoma Department of Human Services, she does not indicate she has a right of access to the submitted information under state or federal law. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 598 (1991), 583 (1990), 451 (1986).*

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/eb

Ref: ID# 760076

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)