



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 24, 2020

Ms. Kristi DeCluitt
Assistant City Attorney
City of Waco
P.O. Box 2570
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2020-18529

Dear Ms. DeCluitt:

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# 838022 (Waco Reference # LGL-20-027).

The City of Waco (the "city") received a request for several specified incident reports. You state you have released some information. You state you will redact motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim 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 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

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 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). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

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). You state Exhibit 3 was used or developed in investigations 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 3 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 552.101 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. 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 remaining information relates to alleged sexual assaults. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally only the information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. ORD 393 at 2; *see Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982)*; *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (Tex. App. —El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have legitimate interest in such information); *Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986)* (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). You argue the remaining information must be withheld in its entirety on the basis of common-law privacy. Upon review, we find this is not a situation in which the entirety of the remaining information must be withheld on the basis of common-law

privacy. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. However, we find some of the information at issue, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Further, you seek to withhold dates of birth in the remaining information. We note some of the individuals whose dates of birth are at issue have been deidentified. Accordingly, with the exceptions of the dates of birth pertaining to deidentified individuals, the remaining dates of birth must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Additionally, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate concern to the public. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit 3 must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we marked and the dates of birth of identified individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.

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,

Melanie Villars
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJV/be

Ref: ID# 838022

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)