



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 10, 2020

Mr. L. Brian Narvaez
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2020-17209

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

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# 835757 (ORR# P014758).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all calls involving two named individual at a specified address. The city states it will redact public citizens' dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2018-07366 (2018).¹ The city also states it is withholding motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.² 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 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial

¹ Open Records Letter No. 2018-07366 authorizes the city to withhold public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

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).

decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses 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. This office has found 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. United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not a compilation of the individual’s criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov’t Code § 411.082(2)(B)* (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Further, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual’s current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person’s current involvement in the criminal justice system).

The present request seeks all reports pertaining to two named individuals. This request requires the city to compile the named individuals’ criminal histories and implicates each named individual’s right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the city has submitted information that does not list either named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not consist of a compilation of the named individuals’ criminal histories, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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). The information submitted as Exhibit C 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 Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).*

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 the information submitted as Exhibit B-2 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 Exhibit B-2.

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 Exhibit B-2 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body

has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. See ORD 208 at 1-2.

The city states portions of the information submitted as Exhibit E identify a complainant who reported violations of law to the department. Based upon the city's representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the names and telephone numbers of the complainants in Exhibit E, which the city marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

Some of the remaining information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with 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. Upon review, we agree most of the information the city marked, as well as the additional information we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, we find the city has not demonstrated some of the information it marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. This information, which we have marked for release, may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Therefore, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information it marked and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. With the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit B-2 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the names and telephone numbers of the complainants in Exhibit E, which the city marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information it marked and

the information we 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.

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/be

Ref: ID# 835757

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)