



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 20, 2022

Mr. Jeremy Anato-Mensah  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2022-14573

Dear Mr. Anato-Mensah:

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# 948761 (Ref. Nos. P004407-022822 & P004899-031522).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received two requests for information from the same requestor pertaining to two specified incident reports involving two named individuals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup> We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it does not pertain to the specified incidents involving the named individuals. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

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 section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

[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 report number 200027823 was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261. *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). Thus, the information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city does not indicate it has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such rule exists. Accordingly, the city must withhold report number 200027823 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. *See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).*<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. 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.). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a 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) (designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history)*. 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. United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 that a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated that the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the information must be withheld in its entirety to protect the individual's privacy.

In this instance, you seek to withhold the entirety of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the information at issue must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. Upon review, however, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the remaining responsive information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 411.083 of the Government Code, which pertains to criminal history record information ("CHRI"). CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center ("NCIC") or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means "information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions." Gov't Code § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990); *see generally* Gov't Code ch. 411 subch. F. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F, or subchapter E-1, of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411. We note, however, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b). We also note Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under

section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.

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.<sup>3</sup> Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold all audible and visible driver's license plates, issuing state for the licensing plates, motor vehicle registration information and motor vehicle record information we marked within the remaining responsive information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold report number 200027823 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked 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 411.083 of the Government Code. The city must withhold all audible and visible driver's license plates, issuing state for the licensing plates, motor vehicle registration information and motor vehicle record information we marked within the remaining responsive information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive information.<sup>4</sup>

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,

Sarah E. Reese  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

SER/jm

---

<sup>3</sup> 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).

<sup>4</sup> We note some of the information being released includes social security numbers. 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).

Ref: ID# 948761

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)