



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 24, 2022

Mr. Alton Estrada  
Assistant City Attorney  
Public Safety Legal Advisor  
City of Amarillo  
200 Southeast 3rd Avenue, 4th Floor  
Amarillo, Texas 79101

OR2022-14958

Dear Mr. Estrada:

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# 949169 (Request No. 2022-704).

The Amarillo Police Department (the "department") received a request for all reports pertaining to a specified address during a certain time period. 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 information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." 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). You argue portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 261.201. Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we marked, 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 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 has not 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 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).* However, we find the department has not demonstrated the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect nor established the remaining information is a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under chapter 261. *See Fam. Code § 261.001(1), (4).* Therefore, the department may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

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).* 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.). Upon review, we also 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.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from 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 is excepted from public release.<sup>1</sup> *See id.* § 552.130. Thus, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we marked under 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The department must withhold the information we marked under 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.<sup>2</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,

Cesar Mata  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

CM/eb

Ref: ID# 949169

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<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).

<sup>2</sup> We note the submitted information 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 under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b). The requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987). 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.