



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 31, 2020

Mr. Trenton M. Dietz
Assistant City Attorney
City of Abilene
P.O. Box 60
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2020-21810

Dear Mr. Dietz:

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# 842219 (ORR# 20-1239).

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for arrest and incident reports involving two named individuals during a stated time period.¹ You state the city will release some information to the requestor. You state the city will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and dates of birth pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter No. 2019-32652 (2019).² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections

¹ You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purposes of clarifying or narrowing request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

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). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Letter No. 2019-32652 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing it to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section

552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions 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. Section 552.101 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. 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 private 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 present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individuals, thus implicating the named individuals’ right to privacy. Accordingly, to the extent the city maintains unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not part of a compilation of the individual’s criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. We note the city has submitted information that does not list the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants. This information does not consist of a compilation of the named individuals’ criminal histories, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. Accordingly, we will address your arguments for this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

- (a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], 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:

552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office.

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a); *see id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201 as a 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). Upon review, we agree some of the information at issue relates to investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city’s police department (the “department”). Thus, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. As you do not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.³ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue involves a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect of a child made under chapter 261 or was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261. Therefore, the city may not withhold the any of remaining information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201(a).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, the following:

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (c), law enforcement records concerning a child and information concerning a child that are stored by electronic means or otherwise from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as adult

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

records, accessible only under controls that are separate and distinct from the controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subsection (c) or Subchapter B, D, or E.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. *See* Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 746, § 22. The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Upon review, we agree some of the remaining information involves a juvenile offender, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.008 apply. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.⁴ However, we find the remaining information does not list a juvenile as a suspect, offender, or defendant. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 58.008 to the remaining information, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), .301(e)(1)(A). You assert report number 15-001917 relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Based upon your representation, we conclude section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to report number 15-001917.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold report number 15-001917 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-prong test described 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 find none of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

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, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *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). 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. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information identifies informers for purposes of the common-law informer's privilege. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold report number 15-001917 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. 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,

James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/mo

Ref: ID# 842219

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)