



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 2, 2020

Mr. Theodore Stoll
Deputy City Clerk
City of Wichita Falls
P.O. Box 1431
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307

OR2020-27411

Dear Mr. Stoll:

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# 852832 (ORR# 802).

The City of Wichita Falls (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named individual and three specified incident reports. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 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 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. 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 privacy 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. However, information relating to routine

traffic violations is not excepted from release under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *Cf.* Gov't Code § 411.082(2)(B). The requestor asks for all information held by the city concerning a named individual. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individual 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. However, the city has submitted documents that do not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Thus, this information does not consist of a compilation of the named individual's criminal history, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.008(b) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

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 and 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 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 ten years old and less than seventeen years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining "child" for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). We find police report number 18-110569 involves juvenile offenders, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). The exceptions in section 58.008 do not appear to apply. Therefore, the city must withhold police report number 18-110569 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.¹ However, the remaining information is not confidential under section 58.008(b) and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the arguments of the city to withhold this 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: (1) 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 information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). The city states the reports it has indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) relate to pending criminal investigations. We note police report number 18-081079 pertains to a criminal mischief offense, which is a misdemeanor with a limitations period of two years. *See* Penal Code § 28.03(b)(1)-(3); Crim. Proc. Code art. 12.02 (limitations on Class A, B, or C misdemeanor is two years from date of offense). More than two years have elapsed since the events giving rise to the criminal mischief offense, and the city does not inform us any criminal charges were filed within the limitation period or explained how release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office may not withhold this report under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, we conclude the release of police report numbers 19-040504 and 20-051022 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to this information.

Section 552.108(a)(2) excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. 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 a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), .301(e)(1)(A). The city asserts police report number 18-101452 pertains to a case that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Therefore, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to this information.

Section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in the *Houston Chronicle* decision. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle* decision). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold police report numbers 19-040504 and 20-051022 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and police report number 18-101452 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *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 city must withhold the submitted dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.² See Gov't Code § 552.130. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individual 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. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold police report numbers 19-040504 and 20-051022 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and police report number 18-101452 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the submitted dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 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 L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jxd

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).

Mr. Theodore Stoll - Page 5

Ref: ID# 852832

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)