



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 13, 2022

Ms. Amanda K. Davis
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2022-16935

Dear Ms. Davis:

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# 953399 (ORR# P22574).

The McKinney Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified case involving the requestor. 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 exception encompasses section 411.153 of the Government Code, which provides as follows:

- (a) A DNA record stored in the DNA database is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].
- (b) A person commits an offense if the person knowingly discloses to an unauthorized recipient information in a DNA record or information related to a DNA analysis of a sample collected under this subchapter.
- (c) An offense under this section is a state jail felony.
- (d) A violation under this section constitutes official misconduct.

Gov't Code § 411.153. A "DNA record" means the results of a forensic DNA analysis performed by a DNA laboratory. *See id.* § 411.141(6)-(7). "Forensic analysis" is defined as "a medical, chemical, toxicologic, ballistic, or other expert examination or test performed on physical evidence, including DNA evidence, for the purpose of determining the connection of the evidence to a criminal action." *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 38.35(4); *see also* Gov't Code § 411.141(10) (providing that "forensic analysis" has meaning assigned by article 38.35). A "DNA database" means "one or more databases that contain forensic DNA records maintained by the director [of the Department of Public Safety ("DPS")]. Gov't Code § 411.141(5); *see id.* § 411.001(3).

The director of DPS is required to establish certain procedures for DNA laboratories. *See id.* §§ 411.142(h) (requiring director establish standards for DNA analysis), .144(a). Section 411.144 of the Government Code provides a DNA laboratory conducting a forensic DNA analysis under subchapter G of chapter 411 shall comply with subchapter G and the rules adopted under subchapter G. *See id.* § 411.144(d); 37 T.A.C. §§ 28.81, .82 (describing minimum standards by which forensic DNA laboratory must abide); *see also* Gov't Code § 411.147(b). Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of records relating to DNA analyses of samples collected under subchapter G of chapter 411 of the Government Code. We further note this information is the result of forensic DNA analyses performed by a DNA laboratory in accordance with DPS regulations. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153(a) of the Government Code. *See City of Fort Worth v. Abbott*, 258 S.W.3d 320, 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2008, no pet.) (section 411.153 prohibits release of DNA records held by city forensic science laboratory regardless of whether records have been forwarded to DPS state DNA database).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). 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, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *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.

You inform us a portion of the submitted information reveals the identity of one or more complainants who reported possible violations of state law that carry criminal penalties to the department. You indicate the subject of the report does not know the identity of the complainant. We note in some circumstances, where an oral statement is captured on tape and the voice of the information is recognizable, it may be necessary to withhold the entire audio statement to protect the informant's identity. Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2 (1986). Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the department has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information we marked and indicated. Therefore, the department may withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information identifies an informer for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the 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. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). 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.). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The requestor has a right of access to her own private information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (“[a] person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves).

Upon review, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the department must withhold all dates of birth that do not pertain to the requestor and the information we marked

under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The department must withhold all dates of birth that do not pertain to the requestor and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.²

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

¹ 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).

² We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.

Ref: ID# 953399

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)