



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 28, 2022

Ms. Delietrice Henry  
Open Records Assistant  
City of Plano  
P.O. Box 860358  
Plano, Texas 75086-0358

OR2022-02524

Dear Ms. Henry:

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# 927221 (ORR #P018078-102221).

The City of Plano (the "city") received a request for all police reports involving two named individuals. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted 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 representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses 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. This office has found 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. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm.*

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

*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. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not a compilation of the individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf.* Gov't Code § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information).

The present request seeks all reports pertaining to named individuals. This request requires the department to compile the named individuals' criminal histories and implicates the named individuals' rights to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note the city has submitted information relating to a routine traffic violation as well as information that does not list the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants. This information does not consist of a compilation of the named individuals' criminal histories, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 also 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 information at issue was used or developed in an investigation 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 department 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 this information, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.<sup>2</sup> See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code 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 conviction or deferred adjudication. See *id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), .301(e)(1)(A). The city states Exhibits B and D pertain to cases that concluded in results other than convictions or deferred adjudications. Therefore, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the remaining information in Exhibit B and D.

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 Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); see also Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). We note basic information includes, among other items, a detailed description of the offense and the offense at issue. See ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information in Exhibits B and D under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. See *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. This office has also concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The 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.). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, in releasing basic information and the remaining information, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See* ORD 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy," which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find none of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the remaining information is not confidential under constitutional privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

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.<sup>3</sup> Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains criminal history record information listing named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we 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

---

<sup>3</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

Sarah E. Reese  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

SER/jm

Ref: ID# 927221

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)