



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 8, 2019

Mr. Jonathan T. Koury
Assistant City Attorney
City of Bryan
P.O. Box 1000
Bryan, Texas 77805

OR2019-12313

Dear Mr. Koury:

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# 770457.

The City of Bryan the ("city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified vehicle accident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim 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. *See* Gov't Code. § 552.301(b). We note the city received the request for information on March 25, 2019. You do not inform us the city was closed on any business days between March 25, 2019, and April 8, 2019. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline for requesting a ruling from this office was April 8, 2019. However, the envelope in which you submitted to this office the information required by section 552.301(b) was postmarked April 9, 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). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of 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 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.3d 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 No. 586 (1991). Because you have provided documentation showing the Brazos County Attorney's Office (the "county attorney's office") objects to the release of the information at issue, we will consider whether the city may withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 or section 552.108 of the Government Code on behalf of the county attorney's office.

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 county attorney's office objects to the release of the submitted information because it pertains to a pending criminal prosecution, and release of the information would interfere with its investigation and prosecution of the case. Generally, the release of information pertaining to an open case is presumed to interfere with the criminal investigation. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). We note, however, the information at issue includes a DIC-24 Statutory Warning. The Statutory Warning has previously been provided to the arrestee. Because a copy of this document has previously been released to the arrestee, we find you have not shown release of the document will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime, and this document may not be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Because the remaining information at issue has not been previously released, we conclude release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information at issue.

However, we note 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). Thus, with the exception of the Statutory Warning and basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the county attorney's office.¹

Next, we address the argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code against disclosure of the Statutory Warning. Section 552.103 provides:

(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 under section 552.103(a).

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. As noted above, the Statutory Warning was

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

provided to the arrestee. Therefore, the city may not withhold the Statutory Warning at issue under section 552.103 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.”² 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. 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.). Thus, the city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth within the Statutory Warning 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 city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked within the Statutory Warning under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the Statutory Warning and basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the county attorney’s office. In releasing the Statutory Warning, 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 and the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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 mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. 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, appearing to read 'KH' followed by a stylized flourish.

Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/be

Ref: ID# 770457

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)