



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 16, 2022

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

OR2022-13922

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# 947788 (ORR# W433317).

The San Antonio Police Department (the "department") received a request for records related to the requestor and a specified address.¹ We understand the department will redact public citizens' dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2016-08566 (2016).² The department claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the department claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

¹ The department states it sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

² Open Records Letter No. 2016-08566 authorizes the department to withhold public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

³ 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”⁴ Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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). Incident number SAPD-2020-0252130 was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the department. *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 department 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 department must withhold incident number SAPD-2020-0252130 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 552.101 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. Act of May 31, 2021, 87th Leg., R.S., S.B. 15, § 5 (to be codified at Transp. Code § 730.003(6)). The Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) is an “agency” for purposes of chapter 730. *See* Transp. Code § 730.003(1) (“agency” is state agency that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records).

⁴ 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).

The department states some of the remaining information consists of records that were obtained by the department 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). We note the requestor has a right of access to his own information pursuant to section 730.006 of the Transportation Code. *See id.* § 730.006 (personal information obtained by agency in connection with motor vehicle record shall be disclosed to requestor who demonstrates requestor has obtained written consent of the person who is subject of the information). Accordingly, with the exception of information pertaining to the requestor, the department must withhold the name, address but not zip code, and medical or disability information of the individual in the marked information the department 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 department marked is not confidential under section 730.004 or 730.013 of the Transportation Code and the department may not withhold that information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. 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)*. We note 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 ORD 208 at 1-2*.

The department states portions of the remaining information identify a complainant who reported violations of law to the department. Based upon the department's representations and our review, we conclude the department has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we marked. Therefore, the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we find the department has not demonstrated the remaining information at issue identifies an individual who reported a criminal violation to the department for purposes of

the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

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 *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the department has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold incident number SAPD-2020-0252130 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. With the exception of information pertaining to the requestor, the department must withhold the name, address but not zip code, and medical or disability information of the individual in the marked information the department received from DPS under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code. The department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information to this requestor.⁵

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

⁵ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the department receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a decision from this office.

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/be

Ref: ID# 947788

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)