



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 16, 2020

Ms. Erin Ham
Deputy City Clerk
City of Wichita Falls
P.O. Box 1431
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307

OR2020-08207

Dear Ms. Ham:

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# 815359 (City ID# 1191).

The City of Wichita Falls (the "city") received a request for twenty-seven specified incident reports. 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 you have only submitted information responsive to eighteen of the twenty-seven specified incident reports. To the extent any information responsive to the remaining portions of the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note some of the submitted information consists of a grand jury subpoena and information obtained pursuant to the grand jury subpoena. The Act is applicable to information "written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business by a governmental body." Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(1). The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. *See id.* § 552.003(1)(B); *see also id.* § 552.0035 (access to judicial records is governed by rules adopted by Supreme Court of Texas or other applicable laws or rules). This office has determined a grand jury, for purposes of the Act, is a part of the

judiciary and therefore is not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by another person or entity acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered to be records in the constructive possession of the grand jury and therefore are not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 398 (1983). *But see* ORD 513 at 4 (defining limits of judiciary exclusion). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean that such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information is also 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. To the extent the city holds the information at issue 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 city is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the city does not hold the information at issue solely as an agent of the grand jury, the information is subject to the Act and we will address the submitted arguments against its disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public 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,¹ 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 and from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(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 also id.* § 51.03(a) (defining "delinquent conduct" 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.,

¹ 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, § 21.

R.S., ch. 746, § 22. The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). We find some of the remaining information involves a juvenile offender, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.008 apply; therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.² We note the city must not release basic information when a report is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.

Section 552.108(a) 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: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, 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). You state the information you indicated relates to ongoing criminal investigations, and release of that information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the cases. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of some 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 information we indicated. However, we note report number 15-020439 relates to an alleged assault offense that occurred in 2015. The statute of limitations for the assault offense is three years from the date of the offense. *See* Penal Code § 21.01(b)(7) (assault); *see also* Crim. Proc. Code art. 12.01(8) (indictment or information for third degree felony assault must be presented within three years of commission of offense). More than three years have elapsed since the events giving rise to the assault incident, and the city does not inform this office any criminal charges were filed within the limitations periods. Further, the city has not otherwise demonstrated release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Therefore, we find the city has not demonstrated the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code to report number 15-020439, and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); Open Records Decision No. 434 (1986). You state the information you indicated pertains to a criminal investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

on this representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue.

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 186-87; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information does not include the identity of the victim, unless the victim is the complainant. See ORD 127 at 3-4. Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 611.002 pertains to mental health records and provides, in pertinent part:

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); see *id.* § 611.001 (defining “patient” and “professional”). Section 611.001 defines a “professional” as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. See *id.* § 611.001(2). Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 provide for access to mental health records only by certain individuals. See *id.* §§ 611.004, .0045; see also Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information, which we marked, consists of mental health records that are subject to chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked mental health records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code.⁴ However, we find you have not demonstrated how any portion of the remaining information at issue consists of a mental health record for purposes of chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 159.002 of the Occupations Code, which provides, in part:

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

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

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician and information obtained from those records. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we find none of the remaining information constitutes medical records subject to section 159.002. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The 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 some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We note some of the remaining information pertains to de-identified individuals whose privacy interests are thus protected. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked and indicated and all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth 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 consists of information pertaining to an identifiable individual that is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the city holds the information at issue 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 city is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. The city must withhold the information we marked under section

552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the marked mental health records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the information we indicated and all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth 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.

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,

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/be

Ref: ID# 815359

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)