



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 8, 2019

Ms. Marie N. Johnson
Counsel for the City of Denison
Messer Fort McDonald
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2019-31693

Dear Ms. Johnson:

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# 803559 (ORR# D100219EE).

The City of Denison (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for case number 19024237. The city claims the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information involves an alleged violation of section 32.51 of the Penal Code, which provides, "[a] person commits an offense if the person, with the intent to harm or defraud another, obtains, possesses, transfers, or uses an item of . . . identifying information of another person without the other person's consent[.]" Penal Code § 32.51(b)(1). For purposes of section 32.51, "identifying information" includes an individual's name and financial institution account number. *Id.* § 32.51(a)(1)(A), (C). Article 2.29 of the Code of Criminal Procedure pertains to alleged violations of section 32.51 that occurred on or after September 1, 2005, and provides:

(a) A peace officer to whom an alleged violation of Section 32.51, Penal Code, is reported shall make a written report to the law enforcement agency that employs the peace officer that includes the following information:

- (1) the name of the victim;
- (2) the name of the suspect, if known;

(3) the type of identifying information obtained, possessed, transferred, or used in violation of Section 32.51, Penal Code; and

(4) the results of any investigation.

(b) On the victim's request, the law enforcement agency shall provide the report created under Subsection (a) to the victim. In providing the report, the law enforcement agency shall redact any otherwise confidential information that is included in the report, other than the information described by Subsection (a).

Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.29. For purposes of article 2.29, an offense is committed on or after September 1, 2005, if no "element of the offense occurs before that date." Act of Jun. 17, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., ch. 294, § 1(b), 2005 Tex. Gen. Laws 885.

In this instance, the submitted information pertains to a report of fraudulent use of identifying information, which constitutes an alleged violation of section 32.51, and the conduct at issue occurred after September 1, 2005. We note the second requestor is the victim of the alleged identity theft listed in the report, and the first requestor is the authorized representative of the victim. Therefore, the submitted report is subject to article 2.29 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.29. Although the city seeks to withhold the report under section 552.108 of the Government Code, this exception does not make information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 586 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.108). Therefore, the submitted report may not be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, a portion of the submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ Because section 552.136 is a confidentiality provision, we will address the applicability of that exception to the submitted information.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding 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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the city must withhold the bank account number we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information to both requestors.²

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

² Because the requestors each have a right of access to the submitted information, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/eb

Ref: ID# 803559

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)