



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 4, 2022

Mr. David V. Overcash
Counsel for the City of Princeton
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, LLP
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 205
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-00205

Dear Mr. Overcash:

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# 923481 (City File No. W027413-092921).

The City of Princeton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all records related to a specified case. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹ We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, you state you sought clarification of a portion of the request for information from the requestor. *See id.* § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over broad request, ten day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified). We understand you have not received a response to the request for clarification. Thus, we find the city is not required to release information in response to the portion of the request for which you have sought but not received clarification. However, if the requestor clarifies or narrows the portion of the request for information for which you sought clarification, the city must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code

¹ We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

§ 552.222; *City of Dallas*, 304 S.W.3d at 387. We note a governmental body has a duty to make a good faith effort to relate a request for information to information the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990).

Next, we address the requestor's assertion that the information at issue is expressly public pursuant to article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides, in relevant part, as follows:

The arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, is public information, and beginning immediately when the warrant is executed the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the warrant and affidavit available for public inspection in the clerk's office during normal business hours.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 15.26. Thus, we interpret article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to apply only to court clerks. Accordingly, we find article 15.26 does not make the submitted information maintained by the city expressly public.

Next, we understand the requestor to assert the submitted information is subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, which provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record," unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Upon review, we find the requestor has failed to establish any portion of the submitted information consists of information that is also contained in a public court record. Therefore, section 552.022(a)(17) is not applicable to the submitted information. Accordingly, we will address the city's arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

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[.]" *Id.* § 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). We understand the information at issue relates to a criminal prosecution in which the defendant at issue was convicted. However, you state the defendant filed an appeal of the conviction and the appeal was pending on the date the city received the request for information. Based upon these representations, 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 at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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

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 information protected by chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See id.* § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F, or subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code* § 411.083(a). Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F, of the Government Code. Upon review, we find the Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) number you have marked consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the city must withhold the marked FBI number under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). However, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broad. Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting Restatement (Second) of Torts § 652I (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Thus, the city must withhold the living public citizen’s date of birth in the remaining information 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked and the additional information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city: (1) may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code; (2) must withhold the marked FBI number under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law; (3) must withhold the living public citizen's date of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (4) must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked and the additional information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (5) must release the remaining information.³

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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/be

Ref: ID# 923481

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ We note the information being released contains an individual's social security number. 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* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).