



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 8, 2020

Mr. Robert Carroll
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Odessa
P.O. Box 4398
Odessa, Texas 79760-4398

OR2020-15619

Dear Mr. Carroll:

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# 831578 (COO Req. ID# P002845-033020).

The City of Odessa (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. The city states it has released the basic information relating to the incident 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.¹ We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city seeks to withhold some of the information it has previously released to the requestor. However, the Act does not permit the selective disclosure of information to the public. Section 552.007 of the Government Code provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential by law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.007, the city may not now withhold the information that was previously released unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential by law. The city seeks to withhold the

¹ We understand the city to raise section 552.130 of the Government Code based on its markings.

information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The purpose of the common-law informer's privilege is to protect the flow of information to a governmental body, rather than to protect a third person. Thus, the informer's privilege, unlike other claims under section 552.101, neither prohibits release nor makes information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 6 (1990). Therefore, the city may not now withhold any portion of the previously released information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

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 this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *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 Exhibit B relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based upon the city’s representation and our review, we conclude release of this information will 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). Accordingly, we find the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. 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.). Thus, the city must withhold the public citizens’ dates 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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information it marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

² Although section 552.108 of the Government Code does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime, *see* Gov’t Code § 552.108(c), the city states it has previously released basic information from this file to the requestor. Additionally, as our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth it marked 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.³

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 A. Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/be

Ref: ID# 831578

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ We note the city has previously asked this office to issue a previous determination permitting the city to withhold information subject to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). We note a previous determination has been recently issued by this office to the city and refer it to Open Records Letter No. 2020-12335 (2020).