



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 31, 2020

Ms. Marie N. Johnson
Counsel for City of Denison
Messer, Fort & McDonald, PLLC
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2020-21824

Dear Ms. Johnson:

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# 842205 (ORR ID D061020PV).

The City of Denison (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 release of the requested information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation by the city's police department. Based upon your representation and our review, we conclude 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 the information at issue.

As you acknowledge, however, 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 the types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information described in *Houston Chronicle* does not include dates of birth. Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the information at issue under section 552.108(a)(1).¹

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, 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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *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). However, we note this office has found that names, telephone numbers, and addresses are not generally excepted from public disclosure under common-law privacy. See *id.* at 7.

Upon review, we find the information 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 within basic information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining basic information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining basic information you have marked under section 552.101 on that basis.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the information at issue under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. Within the basic information, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining basic 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.

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information.

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,

Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/mo

Ref: ID# 842205

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)