



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 6, 2020

Ms. Amy L. Sims  
Deputy City Attorney  
City of Lubbock  
P.O. Box 2000  
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2020-07145

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 815059 (Lubbock File Nos. 2632 and 2688).

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified incident. 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 disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 58.008 of the Family Code,<sup>1</sup> which provides, in part:

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (c), law enforcement records concerning a child and information concerning a child that are stored by electronic means or otherwise from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, we note the 85th Legislature repealed this provision effective September 1, 2017. Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 746 § 13.

- (1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult records;
- (2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as adult records, accessible only under controls that are separate and distinct from the controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and
- (3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subsection (c) or Subchapter B, D, or E.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. *See* Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 746, § 22. The juvenile must have been at least ten years old and less than seventeen years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Upon review, we find none of the submitted information identifies a juvenile suspect or offender for the purposes of section 58.008. Accordingly, we find you have not demonstrated the applicability of section 58.008(b) to this information; thus, the city may not withhold the information under section 552.101 on this basis.

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

(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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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.

(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[.]

*Id.* § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we find the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation by the city's police department of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect and falls within the scope of section 261.201 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). With respect to the first requestor, as you do not indicate the city's police 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 submitted information generally must be withheld in its entirety from the first requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201(a).<sup>1</sup>

The submitted information indicates the second requestor represents a parent of the child victim listed in the information at issue and the requestor's client is not the individual alleged to have committed the suspected abuse or neglect. *See id.* § 261.201(k). Thus, the information at issue may not be withheld from the second requestor on the basis of section 261.201(a). *Id.* Section 261.201(l)(2), however, states that any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law may still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Thus, we will address your remaining arguments for the submitted information.

We note, however, the submitted information includes a CR-3 accident report. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator's accident report), .062 (officer's accident report).

---

<sup>1</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted video recording with respect to the first requestor. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). However, a governmental entity shall release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). *Id.* § 550.065(c), (c-1). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c).

In this instance, both requestors are persons listed under section 550.065(c). Therefore, the requestors have a right of access to the accident report. Thus, with respect to the first requestor, we must address the conflict between the confidentiality provided under section 261.201(a) of the Family Code and the right of access provided under section 550.065(c). Where general and specific statutes are in irreconcilable conflict, the specific provision typically prevails as an exception to the general provision unless the general provision was enacted later and there is clear evidence the legislature intended the general provision to prevail. *See* Gov't Code § 311.026(b); *City of Lake Dallas v. Lake Cities Mun. Util. Auth.*, 555 S.W.2d 163, 168 (Tex. Civ. App.—Fort Worth 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.). In this instance, although section 261.201(a) generally pertains to all records of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect, section 550.065(c) specifically pertains to accident reports. Therefore, we find section 550.065(c) is more specific than, and prevails over, section 261.201(a). Thus, the city may not withhold the accident report from the first requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201(a). We also note, although you assert section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.108 of the Government Code to withhold this information, a statutory right of access prevails over a claim under common-law privacy and the Act's general exceptions to public disclosure. *See 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); *see also 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); Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exception to disclosure under the Act). Because section 552.108 is a general exception under the Act, both requestors' statutory access under section 550.065(c) prevails and the city may not withhold the accident report from either requestor under common-law privacy or section 552.108. Therefore, the city must release the accident report to both requestors pursuant to section 550.065(c).

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation by the city's police department. Based upon your representation and our

review, we conclude release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information.

We note, however, section 552.108 of the Government Code 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*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing the types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information from the second requestor under section 552.108(a)(1).<sup>2</sup>

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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold the basic information under section 552.101 on that basis.

In summary, the city must release the CR-3 accident report to both requestors pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. With respect to the first requestor, the city must withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. With respect to the second requestor, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released to the second requestor, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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->

---

<sup>2</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted video recording with respect to the second requestor. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e). Additionally, as our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information.

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 that reads "Lindsay E. Hale". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "L" and "H".

Lindsay E. Hale  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LEH/be

Ref: ID# 815059

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)