



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 16, 2020

Ms. Julie P. Doshier
Counsel for the City of Highland Village
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L. L. P.
500 North Akard, Suite 1800
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-08157

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 817346 (File# 2019-292-113080).

The City of Highland Village (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the arrest of a named individual in three specified cases.¹ You inform us the city will redact information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code.² 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.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the city failed to meet the statutory deadlines imposed by section 552.301 of the Government Code for the requested information. *See*

¹ We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

² Section 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 under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147(b).

Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The need of a governmental body, other than the governmental body that failed to timely seek an open records decision, to withhold information under section 552.108 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991). Because you inform us, and provide documentation showing, the Denton County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") objects to the release of the submitted information, we will consider whether the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. Additionally, you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code for some of the submitted information. Because section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will also address your arguments under this section for the information at issue. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining exception.

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. 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. Additionally, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy.

In this instance, this request does not seek a compilation of an individual's criminal history; rather, the request is for information pertaining to specified cases. Such a request does not implicate an individual's common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information as criminal history compilation under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. You further claim the submitted information is protected in its entirety by common-law privacy. However, you have not

demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which this information must be withheld in its entirety on that basis. Thus, the city may not withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 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). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See Open Records Decision No. 414 at 4-5 (1987)*. Where a governmental body has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108 as information relating to the pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the district attorney’s office objects to release of the submitted information because it relates to its ongoing prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of the submitted information 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, the city may withhold the information you marked in report number 19008726 and report number 19012610 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office.³

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). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; *see also Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976)* (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information. We note basic information includes a sufficient portion of the narrative to include a detailed description of the offense. *See ORD 127 at 3-4*. In this instance, you have marked the entire narrative portion of report number 19003459 as information you seek to withhold under section 552.108. The remaining information at issue does not contain information sufficient to satisfy the requirement that a “detailed description of the offense” be released as basic information. *See id.* Accordingly, we determine the city must release a sufficient portion of the narrative to encompass a detailed description of the offense. Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, which

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

must be released, the city may withhold report number 19003459 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.⁴

As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). We note the remaining basic information contains identifying information of sexual assault victims. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). We also note information belonging to an individual who has been de-identified may not be withheld under common-law privacy as the de-identified individual's privacy interests are protected.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the dates of birth of identifiable public citizens and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you marked in report number 19008726 and report number 19012610 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold report number 19003459 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. The city must withhold the dates of birth of identifiable public citizens and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.

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.

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/jxd

Ref: ID# 817346

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)