



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 26, 2019

Ms. Laura Anne Coats
Assistant District Attorney
Dallas County Criminal District Attorney's Office
133 North Riverfront Boulevard, LB 19
Dallas, Texas 75207-4399

OR2019-33470

Dear Ms. Coats:

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# 798554.

The Dallas County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for the investigation files for two specified cases. You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.1325 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state some of the submitted information consists of information obtained through grand jury subpoenas. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury, and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411, 398 (1983). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information also is held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of

the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. Thus, to the extent the district attorney's office holds the information obtained through grand jury subpoenas solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the district attorney's office is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the district attorney's office holds the information at issue in its own capacity and not solely as an agent of the grand jury, we will address your arguments against its disclosure.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in pertinent part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

...

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution [is excepted from required public disclosure] if:

...

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3). A governmental body must explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108, .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). In *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379 (Tex. 1994), the Texas Supreme Court held a request for a district attorney's "entire litigation file" was "too broad" and, quoting *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458 (Tex. 1993) (orig. proceeding), held "the decision as to what to include in

[the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case." *Curry*, 873 S.W.2d at 380. The district attorney's office contends the instant request encompasses its entire prosecution file for the cases at issue. Thus, the district attorney's office argues release of the submitted information would reveal the mental impressions or legal reasoning of prosecutors. Based on the district attorney's office's representations and our review, we agree sections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) of the Government Code are applicable to the submitted information.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston* 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). See Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the district attorney's office may withhold the remaining information under sections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) of the Government Code and the court's ruling in *Curry*.¹

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. 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. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the district attorney's office 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 doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently, and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the district attorney's office's remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.


common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the submitted information, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual’s privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the district attorney’s office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

In summary, to the extent the district attorney’s office holds the information obtained through grand jury subpoenas solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the district attorney’s office is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the district attorney’s office may withhold the remaining information under sections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) of the Government Code in conjunction with the court’s ruling in *Curry*.

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,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/rm

Ref: ID# 798554

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)