



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 24, 2022

Mr. David Overcash
Counsel for the City of Princeton
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, L.L.P.
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 300
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-08535

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# 938112 (Reference No. W028204-121321).

The City of Princeton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all records pertaining to a specified address or a named individual and the requestor.¹ We understand you will redact social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.² You claim some of the submitted information is 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 information.

¹ You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 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.2d 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).

² 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).

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.

Upon review, we find the present request, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual. We find this part of the request generally implicates the named individual’s right to privacy. However, we note the requestor also seeks information involving herself. This part of the request seeks specified records involving the requestor and does not implicate the named individual’s right to privacy. Further, the requestor has a special right of access to her own information that would ordinarily be withheld to protect her privacy interests. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (person or person’s authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Therefore, information relating to the requestor may not be withheld from her as a compilation of criminal history under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Accordingly, with the exception of the reports involving the requestor, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note the city has submitted information that does not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not consist of a compilation of the named individual’s criminal history, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [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 or suspected child abuse or neglect. *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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

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). You state the information you marked pertains to a pending criminal investigation. Based upon 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 marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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). You state the information you marked pertains to closed criminal investigations that did not result in convictions or deferred adjudications. Therefore, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information you marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by the common-law informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The 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 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 (1990), 515 at 4-5. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You state the information you marked contains the identifying information of a complainant who reported possible criminal activities to the Princeton Police Department. However, upon review, we note the information at issue reveals that the subject of the complaint at issue knows the identity of the complainant. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information at issue, and the city may not withhold any portion of it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of 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. Additionally,

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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.). We note the requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Nevertheless, upon review, we find some of the remaining information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to her own motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from her under section 552.130. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the reports involving the requestor, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any 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 of the Family Code. The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.⁵

⁵ We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

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,

Kimbell Kesling
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KK/jxd

Ref: ID# 938112

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)