



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 14, 2019

Mr. Marc J. Schnall
Counsel for the City of Selma
Langley & Banack Incorporated
745 East Mulberry, Suite 700
San Antonio, Texas 78212

OR2019-22488

Dear Mr. Schnall:

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# 780767.

The City of Selma (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for documents related to a specified internal investigation and video and audio recordings, written statements, and court testimony related to a specified case involving the requestor.¹ You state the city does not possess information responsive to a portion of the request.² You claim portions of the submitted information are 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.

Initially, you inform us some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2019-02867 (2019). There is no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, for the requested information that is

¹We note the city received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request).

²The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-02867 as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure). We will address your arguments against disclosure for the submitted information, which is not subject to the prior ruling.

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 information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201 of the Family Code 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.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k). A portion of the submitted information, which you marked, was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city’s police department. *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). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. In this instance, the requestor is a parent of the child victim listed in the information at issue. However, we note the requestor is alleged to have committed the suspected abuse or neglect. Thus, the requestor does not have a right of access to the information at issue under section 261.201(k). *See id.* § 261.201(k). Therefore, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.³ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

In summary, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-02867 as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must release the remaining information.⁴

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Deborah Southerland
Attorney
Open Records Division

DS/jxd

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

⁴**Error! Main Document Only.** We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person’s agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.

Mr. Marc J. Schnall - Page 4

Ref: ID# 780767

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)