



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 17, 2022

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78207

OR2022-07871

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 936497 (File No. W418582).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for the information pertaining to a specified location.¹ The city claims portions of the submitted information are exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

¹ We note the city sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

² 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.

(b) 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 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). The city asserts report number 21095551 involves delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision. It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.008 apply. Therefore, we agree the city must withhold report number 21095551 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 730.004 of the Transportation Code, which provides “an agency may not disclose personal information about any person obtained by the agency in connection with a motor vehicle record.” Transp. Code § 730.004. “Personal information” means “information that identifies a person,” and includes a person’s photograph, social security number, date of birth, driver identification number, name, address but not the zip code, e-mail address, telephone number, and medical or disability information. *Id.* § 730.003(6). The Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) is an “agency” for purposes of chapter 730. *See id.* § 730.003(1) (“agency” is state agency that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records). The city states some of the information at issue consists of records that were obtained by the city from DPS. *See id.* § 730.007(a)(2)(A)(i) (personal information may be disclosed to government agency in carrying out its functions). An authorized recipient of personal information may not re-disclose the personal information and to do so is a misdemeanor offense. *Id.* § 730.013(a), (d). Accordingly, the city must withhold the driver name and address but not zip code of the individual in the marked information the city received from DPS under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code. However, the remaining information the city marked is not confidential under section 730.004 or 730.013 of the Transportation Code

and the city may not withhold that information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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 that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The city states report numbers 21214496 and 21208226 relate to pending criminal investigations or prosecutions. Based upon these representations and our review, we find 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 report numbers 21214496 and 21208226.

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*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold report numbers 21214496 and 21208226 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, the informer’s privilege does not apply where the informant’s identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 (1978). The city states the information at issue identifies a complainant who reported a violation of state law to the city’s police department. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 on the basis of the informer’s privilege.

Section 552.101 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. 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*. Thus, 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 the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern or it pertains to an individual who has been deidentified. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.130 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 we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold report number 21095551 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. The city must withhold the driver name and address but not zip code of the individual in the marked information the city received from DPS under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold report numbers 21214496 and 21208226 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold any of the information we marked under section 552.101 on the basis of the informer's privilege. 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

³ 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).

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,

Sarah E. Reese
Attorney
Open Records Division

SER/be

Ref: ID# 936497

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)