



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 28, 2020

Ms. Montana Anderson
Litigation & PIA Paralegal
City of Abilene
P.O. Box 60
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2020-32259

Dear Ms. Anderson:

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# 860306 (PIR No. 20-2144).

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to four specified cases. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.152 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim 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 (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and

compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

You assert the present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning a named individual. We note, however, the request is for information pertaining to specified incidents. Thus, we find this request does not require the city to compile an individual's criminal history and does not implicate the privacy interests of any individual. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information as a criminal history compilation under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 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, a portion of the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city's police 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 it 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 the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Upon review, however, we find the city has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(2). Furthermore, the city has not established the remaining information is a report of alleged

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

or suspected abuse or neglect made under section 261.201(a)(1). *See* Fam. Code § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Fam. Code ch. 261). Therefore, city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

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 the release of the requested information 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 (Tex. 1977). The city states the information at issue pertains to an active criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the 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 you indicated.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). The city states the remaining information pertains to a closed case that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the remaining information.

However, we note 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 *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note the basic information includes, among other items, the identities of investigating officers. Thus, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.²

The city seeks to withhold the identifying information of undercover officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code. Section 552.152 provides,

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from [required public disclosure] if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.152. You inform us some of the information at issue pertains to undercover or covert officers. However, you have not marked or otherwise indicated which, if any, of the officers are undercover or covert officers, nor does the information at issue give any indication of the officers' status. Thus, we must rule conditionally. To the extent the officers at issue in the basic information are undercover or covert officers, the city must withhold the identifying information of these officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code. To the extent the officers at issue in the basic information are not undercover or covert officers, we find you have failed to demonstrate the release of the information at issue would subject a city employee or officer to a substantial risk of physical harm, and the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

You also argue the basic information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed 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 the city has failed to demonstrate any portion of the basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the basic information under section 552.101 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 of the Family Code. With the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the officers at issue in the basic information are undercover or covert officers, the city must withhold the identifying information of these officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

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,

Meagan Hunter
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MH/mo

Ref: ID# 860306

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)