



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 17, 2020

Ms. Marie N. Johnson
Counsel for the City of Denison
Messer, Fort & McDonald
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2020-11211

Dear Ms. Johnson:

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# 822913 (ORR# D012720DF).

The City of Denison (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all reports pertaining to a specified location during a specified time period. The city states it is releasing some of the requested information. 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.

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 incident number 20001899 pertains to an active criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the 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 incident number 20001899.

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 basic information, the city may withhold incident number 20001899 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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 this chapter 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 this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Incident number 19028590 was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city’s police department (the “department”). 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). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. The city does not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information and therefore we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold incident number 19028590 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.¹ See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000 and makes confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. See Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). The city indicates it is part of an emergency communication district that is subject to section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. The city marked a telephone

¹ As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address the remaining argument against its disclosure.

number that it seeks to withhold. We conclude the city must withhold the marked telephone number under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code if it consists of the originating telephone number furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. If the marked information does not consist of the originating telephone number provided by a 9-1-1 service supplier, it may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 772.318.

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 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.). We note an individual's name, address, and telephone number are generally not private information under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person's name, address, or telephone number not invasion of privacy). Upon review, we find some of the submitted Information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the requestor's date of birth, to which the requestor has a right of access pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code, the city must also withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *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 herself). However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information it marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold incident number 20001899 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must

withhold incident number 19028590 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the marked telephone number under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code if it consists of the originating telephone number furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the city must also withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information it marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

The city also asks this office to issue a previous determination that would permit it to withhold information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code without requesting a ruling from this office. Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). 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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/jxd

Ref: ID# 822913

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)