



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 12, 2020

Ms. Lizbeth Islas Plaster
City Attorney
City of Lewisville
P.O. Box 299002
Lewisville, Texas 75029-9002

OR2020-07818

Dear Ms. Plaster:

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# 816170 (COL Ref. No. P035960-122619).

The City of Lewisville (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident involving the requestor's client.¹ The city states it has released some information to the requestor. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record[,] unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). The city seeks to withhold the information at issue under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary

¹ We note the city received an initial request for the same information from this requestor on December 3, 2019. In response to the initial request, the city informs us it released basic information to the requestor within five business days and withheld certain information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code, pursuant to the previous determination this office issued to the city in Open Records Letter No. 2016-25470 (2016). Subsequently, the requestor made a second request for the same information on December 26, 2019.

exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the city may not withhold the court-filed documents, which we have marked, under section 552.108. However, we will address the city's arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

Next, we note the remaining information includes a Toxicology Request Submission Form. Section 724.018 of the Transportation Code provides that, on the request of the person who has given a specimen at the request of a peace officer, full information concerning the analysis of the specimen must be made available to that person or the person's attorney. Transp. Code § 724.018. Here, the requestor represents the individual who submitted the specimen. The city seeks to withhold this information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, we note a statutory right of access generally prevails over the exceptions to public disclosure under the Act. *See, e.g.*, 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). Thus, the city must release the Toxicology Request Submission Form to this requestor pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code.

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 the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The city states the information at issue pertains to an active criminal investigation or prosecution. Generally, the release of information pertaining to an open case is presumed to interfere with the criminal investigation. *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). We note, however, the information at issue includes a DIC-24 Statutory Warning and a DIC-25 Notice of Suspension. The DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms have previously been provided to the arrestee. Because copies of these documents have previously been released to the arrestee, we find the city has not shown release of these documents will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime, and these documents may not be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Because the remaining information at issue has not been previously released, we conclude release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information at issue.

However, we note 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*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the DIC-24 and DIC-25

forms and the basic information, the city may withhold the information it did not mark for release under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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 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 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.). Upon review, we find the date of birth the city marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, we note the requestor has a right of access to her client’s date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the date of birth it marked 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. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. Upon review, we find the information the city marked consist of motor vehicle record information. However, we note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Therefore, the requestor has a right of access to her client’s motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the motor vehicle record information it marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must release the court-filed documents we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. The city must release the Toxicology Request Submission Form to this requestor pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code. With the exception of the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms and the basic information, the city may withhold the information it did not mark for release under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.²

² As previously noted, the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* 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.

Finally, the city asks this office to issue a previous determination that would permit it to withhold public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without the necessity of requesting a decision form this office. We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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,



Gerald Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/jxd

Ref: ID# 816170

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)