



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 1, 2020

Ms. Susan Camp-Lee  
Counsel for the City of Round Rock  
Sheets & Crossfield, P. C.  
309 East Main Street  
Round Rock, Texas 78664-5246

OR2020-16775

Dear Ms. Camp-Lee:

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# 835469.

The City of Round Rock (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's client. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

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). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). The city states Exhibit B relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of this 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976).

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 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 48.101 of the Human Resources Code, which pertains to the disclosure of reports of abuse, neglect, or exploitation of elderly and disabled persons in certain facilities. Section 48.101 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(a) The following information is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]:

(1) a report of abuse, neglect, or exploitation made under this chapter;

(2) the identity of the person making the report; and

(3) except as provided by this section, all files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in an investigation made under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

(b) Confidential information may be disclosed only for a purpose consistent with this chapter and as provided by [the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (the "DFPS")] or investigating state agency rule and applicable federal law.

Hum. Res. Code § 48.101(a), (b). Section 48.051 of the Human Resources Code provides "a person having cause to believe that an elderly person, a person with a disability, or an individual receiving services from a provider as described by Subsection F [of chapter 48 of the Human Resources Code] is in the state of abuse, neglect, or exploitation" shall report certain prescribed information to the DFPS or another appropriate state agency. See *id.* § 48.051(a). The only entities authorized to conduct an investigation under chapter 48 of the Human Resources Code are DFPS and certain other state agencies, depending on the circumstances surrounding the incident. See *id.* §§ 48.151, .152, .252, .301. Thus, reports the department creates generally are not subject to section 48.101. The city's police department created the information in Exhibit C in connection with a criminal investigation it conducted. The city has not demonstrated the Adult Protective Services division of DFPS ("APS") used or developed the information at issue in an APS investigation under chapter 48 of the Human Resources Code. See *id.* § 48.101(a)(3). Thus, the city has failed to demonstrate the information at issue pertains to an investigation conducted by an entity authorized to conduct such an investigation under chapter 48. Accordingly, the city may

not withhold Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 48.101 of the Human Resources Code.

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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *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). In addition, 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. 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.). 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); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Nevertheless, the city must withhold the remaining dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We also find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the city must also withhold the information we have 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.<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).

In summary, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the date of birth of the requestor's client, the city must withhold the submitted dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

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,

James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/rm

Ref: ID# 835469

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup> Because the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor. We also note the information at issue contains a social security number. 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. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).