



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 22, 2022

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

OR2022-08187

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# 937882 (ORR# 22-4).

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 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. This section 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). The city asserts the submitted information is confidential under section 261.201. However, we find the city has not established this information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code or consists of a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect. *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). Therefore, the submitted information is not confidential under section 261.201(a) of the Family Code and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 730.004 of the Transportation Code, which provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, including [the Act], except as provided by sections 730.005-730.007, 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. Section 730.004 applies only to an “agency” that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records. *See id.* § 730.003(1). Upon review, we find the city has not submitted arguments establishing it compiles or maintains motor vehicle records. Therefore, the submitted information is not confidential under section 730.004 or 730.013, and the city may not withhold any of it under section 552.101 on either of those grounds.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 411 of the Government Code, which pertains to criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. Title 28 of 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 law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code makes CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains confidential, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in subchapters E-1 and F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code* § 411.083(a). The submitted information does not contain CHRI for purposes of chapter 411. Therefore, the submitted information is not confidential under chapter 411, and the city may not withhold any of it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision* Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). In addition, 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. 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. We also find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the city must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law 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. *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. However, section 552.130 is not applicable to the remaining information and the city may not withhold any of it on that ground.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”<sup>1</sup> *Id.* § 552.136(b). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for purposes of section 552.136. Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Thus, the city must withhold the submitted insurance policy number under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the following: (1) the submitted dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (3) the submitted insurance policy number under section 552.136 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

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

Ref: ID# 937882

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)