



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 11, 2022

Ms. P. Armstrong
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1400 Botham Jean Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2022-10553

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

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# 941870 (ORR# D042615).

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. The department claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.108(a) 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[.]" 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 information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1),

¹ The department acknowledges, and we agree, it did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code and third-party interests can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301.

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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). The department has submitted correspondence from the Dallas County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") objecting to the release of the information that the department has marked because it relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of this information 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.³

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 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 concluded the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *Cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 628 at 3 (1994) (identities of juvenile victims of serious sexual offenses must be withheld on basis of common-law privacy). Upon review, we 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 department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department 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

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other arguments of the department to withhold this information.

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/mo

Ref: ID# 941870

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)