



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 17, 2019

Ms. Julie P. Doshier  
Counsel for the City of Highland Village  
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager, & Smith, L. L. P.  
500 North Akard Street, Suite 1800  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2019-25962

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 786048.

The City of Highland Village (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident involving a named individual. You state the city will withhold information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2016-21546 (2016).<sup>1</sup> 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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 section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Letter No. 2016-21546 is a previous determination authorizing the city to withhold the dates of birth of living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

(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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You state the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city's police department (the '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. You do not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information and therefore we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.<sup>2</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

We note, however, the requestor is a representative of the United States Army (the "Army"). The United States Department of Defense (the "DoD") is authorized to perform background investigations of persons seeking acceptance or retention in the armed services. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 9101(b)(1)(C); *see also id.* § 9101(a)(6)(A) (DoD is a covered agency for purposes of section 9101). The Army has a right to the criminal history record information ("CHRI") of state and local criminal justice agencies when it receives the consent of the individual being investigated for release of such information. *See id.* § 9101(b)(1), (c); *see also* 10 U.S.C. § 111(b)(6) (DoD includes the Department of the Army). CHRI is defined as "information collected by criminal justice agencies on individuals consisting of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, indictments, informations, or other formal criminal charges, and any disposition arising therefrom, sentencing, correction supervision, and release" but does not include "identification information such as fingerprint records to the extent that such information does not indicate involvement in the criminal justice system" or "records of a State or locality sealed pursuant to law from access by State and local criminal justice agencies of that State or locality." 5 U.S.C. § 9101(a)(2).

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against the disclosure of this information.

Federal law provides the Army's right of access to CHRI preempts state confidentiality provisions. *Id.* § 9101(b)(4) (section 9101 "shall apply notwithstanding any other provision of law . . . of any State"). We conclude the Army's right of access under federal law preempts section 261.201 of the Family Code, as well as section 552.108 of the Government Code. *See English v. General Elec. Co.*, 496 U.S. 72, 79 (1990) (noting state law is preempted to extent it actually conflicts with federal law); *see also La. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 369 (1986) (noting a federal agency acting within scope of its congressionally delegated authority may preempt state regulation). We further note a specific statutory right of access prevails over common-law privacy. *Collins v. Tex Mall, L.P.*, 297 S.W.3d 409, 415 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2009, no pet.) (statutory provision controls and preempts common law only when statute directly conflicts with common-law principle); *CenterPoint Energy Houston Elec. LLC v. Harris County Toll Rd. Auth.*, 436 F.3d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 2006) (common law controls only where there is no conflicting or controlling statutory law); *see also Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4* (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge in statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exceptions to disclosure under the Act). Federal law, however, also provides the Army's right of access is contingent on the request being made for eligibility or retention purposes, and on receiving written consent from the individual under investigation for the release of such CHRI. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 9101(c).

In this instance, however, we have no indication that the request was made for eligibility or retention purposes or that the individual under investigation provided the requisite signed authorizations for the release of the information at issue. Therefore, to the extent the request was not made for eligibility or retention purposes or the Army does not provide written consent for release from the individual being investigated, the city must withhold the entirety of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.<sup>3</sup> *See* Attorney General Opinions DM-353 at 4 n.6 (1995) (finding interagency transfer of information prohibited where confidentiality statute enumerates specific entities to which release of information is authorized and where potential receiving governmental body is not among statute's enumerated entities), JM-590 at 4-5 (1986). However, to the extent the request was made for eligibility or retention purposes and the Army provides signed written consent for release from the individual being investigated, the city must release the CHRI at issue and, in that instance, must withhold the remaining under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.<sup>4</sup>

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.


---

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

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick P. Mehaffy". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with some loops and flourishes.

Patrick P. Mehaffy  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PPM/jxd

Ref: ID# 786048

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)