



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 13, 2019

Mr. Brian Sears
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2019-12788

Dear Mr. Sears:

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# 765078 (PIR# 19-0880).

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to specified investigations conducted by the Public Integrity Unit. You state the department is releasing some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, which we understand to be a representative sample.¹

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); Open Records Decision No. 434 (1986). You state the information you marked pertains to

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.

concluded criminal investigations by the department that did not result in convictions or deferred adjudications. Based on your representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the 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 Publishing 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). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes a detailed description of the offense and the identity of the complainant, but does not include the identity of the victim, unless the victim is the complainant. *See id.* at 3-4. We also note basic information does not include dates of birth, e-mail addresses, telephone numbers, motor vehicle record information encompassed by section 552.130 of the Government Code, or social security numbers of individuals other than an arrestee. *See id.* Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(2) 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. This section encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). It protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You state portions of the remaining information identify a complainant who reported alleged violations of law to the department. You further indicate the alleged violations are punishable by criminal penalties under the Penal Code. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude you have demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in

conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.² However, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue identifies an informer for purposes of the common-law informer's privilege. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 520 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 659 at 5 (1999). In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also* *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information). Further, 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.). However, the public has a legitimate interest in knowing the details of a crime. *See* *Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting a "legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity" (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (5th Cir. 1994))).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the supreme court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, we find two of the dates of birth pertain to individuals who have been de-identified under the informer's privilege and common-law privacy; thus, these individuals' privacy interests are protected and the

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

department may not withhold these dates of birth under section 552.101 on that basis. Accordingly, with the exception of the dates of birth pertaining to the individuals who have been de-identified, the department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.³ However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently, and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. ORD 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the remaining information at issue, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional 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.⁴ See Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. With the exception of the dates of birth pertaining to the individuals who have been de-identified, the department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.⁵

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,



Blake Brennan
Attorney
Open Records Division

BB/gw

Ref: ID# 765078

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁵We note the remaining information includes social security numbers. 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 the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).