



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 3, 2022

Mr. James Kopp  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of San Antonio  
P.O. Box 839966  
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2022-16023

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# 951506 (COSA File No. W436807).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident and all information pertaining to a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, the city asserts the submitted information that consists of "automatic systems warnings" is not responsive to the request for information. However, this information is located within documents that were specifically requested. Thus, we find this information is responsive to the request for information. Accordingly, the city must release this information, unless it is excepted from release under the Act.

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. 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) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not a compilation of the individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

The present request requires the city to compile the named individual's criminal history and implicates the named individual's right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has submitted documents that do not constitute a compilation of the named individual's criminal history. Thus, this information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground. Additionally, we note the requestor also seeks information pertaining to a specified incident. Because the requestor specifically asks for this information, it is not part of a compilation of the individual's criminal history. Thus, this 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 other statutes, such as 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. *Id.* § 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). The city 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). Accordingly, the city must withhold the names and the addresses but not zip codes of the individuals in the marked information the city 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 city marked is not confidential under section 730.004 or 730.013 of the Transportation Code and the city may not withhold that information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

As previously noted, 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. 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.). 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 satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a governmental body must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990)* (construing statutory predecessor). This office has concluded section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989)* (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g., ORDs 531 at 2-3* (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You explain the remaining responsive information contains “automatic system warnings, which are automatic warnings that populate in call for service sheets based on a geographic location regardless of the nature or subject of the incident.” You assert release of such information would interfere with law enforcement. Based on your arguments and our review of the information at issue, we agree release of the information you marked would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration,

or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country.<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the names and the addresses but not zip codes of the individuals in the marked information the city 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 city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1). The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city 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 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,

Joseph Hoggatt  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JWH/mo

Ref: ID# 951506

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, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).