



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 8, 2020

Mr. M. Matthew Ribitzki
Deputy City Attorney
City of Burleson
141 West Renfro Street
Burleson, Texas 76028

OR2020-25396

Dear Mr. Ribitzki:

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# 850955 (Reference No. 20-1043).

The City of Burleson (the "city") received a request for five specified incidents. You state the city will redact motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ Further, you state the city will redact dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2016-08169 (2016).² 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.

¹ 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). 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). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

² Open Records Letter No. 2016-08169 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing it to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301 (a) of the Government Code).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

[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:

- (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). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information was used or developed in investigations of alleged child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201 of Family Code). Thus, this information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city does not indicate it has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such rule exists. Given that assumption, 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).

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 *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. 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 a legitimate

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

interest in such information). Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information relate to incidents involving sexual assault or other sex-related offenses. Therefore, to the extent any of the information at issue identifies a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense, the city must withhold this information, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. 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 the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. To the extent any of the information at issue identifies a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense, the city must withhold this information, which 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,

Jahnna Ward
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JW/be

Ref: ID# 850955

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)