



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 30, 2019

Ms. P. Armstrong  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1400 South Lamar Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor 6W  
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2019-24447

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

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# 791220 (ORR# D017243).

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim some of 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 representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the department failed to meet the statutory deadlines imposed by section 552.301 of the Government Code for withholding the requested information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). 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). The need of a governmental body, other than the one that failed to timely seek an open records decision, to withhold information under section 552.108 can provide a compelling reason sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness. Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991). Because you inform us, and provide documentation showing, the Dallas County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") objects to the release of the information at issue, we will consider

---

<sup>1</sup>We 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.

whether the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 on behalf of the district attorney's office. Further, you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code for some of the submitted information. Because this section can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your argument under this section for the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a) 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: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, 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). You state, and submit documentation demonstrating, the district attorney’s office objects to the release of the information you marked because it pertains to a pending criminal investigation. Based upon this representation, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable, and the release of the information you marked would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally, only information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983); *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 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). 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”

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

(citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994))). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. See *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.).

Upon review, we conclude some of the remaining information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, we note the date of birth you marked pertains to an individual who will be de-identified, and whose privacy interest will therefore be protected. Therefore, the department may not withhold the date of birth of the de-identified individual under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Accordingly, with the exception of the date of birth pertaining to the de-identified individual, the department must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. With the exception of the date of birth pertaining to the de-identified individual, the department must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department 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 <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,



Jesse Harvey  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JH/gw

Ref: ID# 791220

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)