



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 18, 2019

Mr. Arturo D. Rodriguez, Jr.  
Counsel for the City of Jarrell  
Russell Rodriguez Hyde Bullock, LLP  
1633 Williams Drive, Building 2, Suite 200  
Georgetown, Texas 78628

OR2019-26153

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

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# 786409.

The City of Jarrell (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for all information related to a specified investigation. 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.

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information consists of a city police officer's body worn camera recording. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;
- (2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and

(3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestors do not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestors did not properly request the body worn camera recording at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.<sup>1</sup> However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.* § 1701.661(b).

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 section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we find the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect by the city's police department (the "department") under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *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 the remaining information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. As you do not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, and based on our review, we determine the city must withhold the remaining information in its entirety from the second requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.<sup>2</sup> However, we note the first requestor a parent of the child victim in the information at issue, and is not alleged to have committed the suspected abuse or neglect. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information from the first requestor under section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(l)(2) states any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Accordingly, we will consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information at issue to the first requestor.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than 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) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state "to the [c]ity's knowledge" remaining information pertains to a criminal case that "has not resulted in a conviction or deferred adjudication." We note section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable only if the information at issue is related to a concluded criminal case "that *did not* result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]" *See id.* § 552.108(a)(2) (emphasis added). Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) to the

---

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

remaining information, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information from the first requestor on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 No. 208 at 1-2 (1978)*. The informer's privilege 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 1-2 (1981)* (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. 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)*. However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. *Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990)*. We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See ORD 208 at 1-2*.

You claim the remaining information identifies a complainant who reported violations of law to the department. However, upon review of the submitted information, we find the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of the common-law informer's privilege.

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. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual's criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private

citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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.). We note the first requestor has a right of access to her own otherwise private information and the otherwise private information related to her minor child pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code, and this information may not be withheld from her under common-law privacy. *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 individual requests information concerning herself). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked and the dates of birth not belonging to the requestor or her minor child 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.<sup>3</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to her own motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from him under section 552.130. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, as the requestors did not properly request the body worn camera recording at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information, and the city need not release it in response to these requests for information. The city must withhold the remaining information in its entirety from the second requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The city must: (1) withhold the information we have marked and the

---

<sup>3</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481, 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

dates of birth not belonging to the requestor or her minor child under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; (3) withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure; and (4) release the remaining information to the first requestor.<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.

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,



Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/eb

Ref: ID# 786409

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup> We note the information being released contains social security numbers not belonging to the first requestor or her minor child. 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Furthermore, as noted above, the first requestor has a right of access to the information being released. *See* Fam Code § 261.201(k); Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. 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.