



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 9, 2019

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Counsel for the City of Euless
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2019-28306

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 790490.

The City of Euless (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified case involving a named individual. You state the city will redact information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.136 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes information subject to section 552.022(a) of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part:

- (a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter

¹Section 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). 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 id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684.

²Although you do not cite section 552.136 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise this exception based upon your markings.

or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). The submitted information includes court-filed documents, which we marked, that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17). The information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(17). You seek to withhold some of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public records. *See Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, no portion of the court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17) may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 411.153(a) of the Government Code, which provides “[a] DNA record stored in the DNA database is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under the [Act].” *Id.* § 411.153(a). A “DNA record” means the results of a forensic DNA analysis performed by a DNA laboratory. *See id.* § 411.141(6)-(7). “Forensic analysis” is defined as “a medical, chemical, toxicologic, ballistic, or other expert examination or test performed on physical evidence, including DNA evidence, for the purpose of determining the connection of the evidence to a criminal action.” Crim. Proc. Code art. 38.35(4); *see also* Gov't Code § 411.141(10) (“forensic analysis” has meaning assigned by article 38.35). A “DNA database” means “one or more databases that contain forensic DNA records maintained by the director of [the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”)].” Gov't Code § 411.141(5); *see id.* § 411.001(3).

The director of DPS is required to establish certain procedures for DNA laboratories. *See id.* §§ 411.142(h) (requiring director establish standards for DNA analysis), .144(a). Section 411.144 of the Government Code provides a DNA laboratory conducting a forensic DNA analysis under subchapter G of chapter 411 must comply with subchapter G and the rules adopted under subchapter G. *See id.* § 411.144(d); 37 T.A.C. §§ 28.91, .92 (describing minimum standards by which forensic DNA laboratory must abide); *see also* Gov't Code § 411.147(b).

You state the information you marked consists of records relating to DNA analyses of samples collected under subchapter G of chapter 411 of the Government Code. We understand this information is the result of forensic DNA analyses performed by a DNA laboratory in accordance with DPS regulations. Based upon your representations and our review, we find the information at issue is confidential under section 411.153(a). Therefore, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153(a) of the Government Code. *See*

City of Fort Worth v. Abbott, 258 S.W.3d 320, 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2008, no pet.) (section 411.153 prohibits release of DNA records held by city forensic science laboratory regardless of whether records have been forwarded to DPS state DNA database).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You assert some of the remaining information is confidential pursuant to section 261.201(a). However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue consists of a report of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect, nor does the information reveal the identity of an individual who made a report of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect for purposes of section 261.201(a)(1). *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 disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201). Furthermore, we find you have failed to demonstrate this information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(2). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201(a).

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. This common-law right to privacy protects the identifying information of a complainant in certain situations based on the facts of the case. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982) (concluding common-law privacy protects identifying information of victim of serious sexual offense). 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* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of a particular insurance carrier), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. 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.). However, this office has also found the public has a legitimate public interest in the details of a crime. *See* Open Records Decision No. 400 at 4 (1983). *See generally Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting "legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity" (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994))).

Upon review, we conclude some of the remaining information, which we marked, meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked and all public citizens' dates of birth 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, and the city may not withhold any 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 informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *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). The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity.

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

Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). You state the remaining information contains the identifying information of complainants who reported potential criminal activities and violations of law. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue identifies a complainant for purposes of the informer's privilege. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential.⁴ Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to "peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]" *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Thus, to the extent the information we marked relates to licensed peace officers who elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), it must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. If the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed peace officers or do not elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.1175.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information consists of a credit card, debit card, or charge card number, or is an access device number used to obtain money, goods, services, or any item of value, or used to initiate the transfer of funds. *See id.* §§ 552.136(a), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.136 of the Government Code to any of the remaining information at issue, and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information at issue relates to licensed peace officers who elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

⁴The 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).

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,



Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/mo

Ref: ID# 790490

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)