



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 29, 2022

Mr. Nico Arias  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2022-18918

Dear Mr. Arias:

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# 953976 (PIR No. E002114-032422).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for police records pertaining to a specified address and named individual during a particular timeframe. You state you will release some information. 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.

Initially, we note the requestor is a representative of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (the "DFPS") and understand she claims she has a right of access to the information at issue pursuant to section 261.105 of the Family Code. Section 261.105 provides, in relevant part:

- (a) All reports received by a local or state law enforcement agency that allege abuse or neglect by a person responsible for a child's care, custody, or welfare shall be referred immediately to the [DFPS].
- (b) The [DFPS] shall immediately notify the appropriate state or local law enforcement agency of any report it receives, other than a report from a law enforcement agency, that concerns the suspected abuse or neglect of a child or death of a child from abuse or neglect.

Fam. Code § 261.105(a), (b). However, we find the submitted information does not involve child abuse or neglect by any individual relating to a child to whom that individual is responsible for the care, custody, or welfare. Accordingly, we find the requestor has failed to demonstrate she has a right of access to the submitted information under section 261.105.

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 58.008(b) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

Except as provided by Subsection (c), law enforcement records concerning a child and information concerning a child that are stored by electronic means or otherwise and from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

- (1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult records;
- (2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as adult records, accessible only under controls that are separate and distinct from the controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and
- (3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subsection (c) or Subchapter B, D, or E.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. *See Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 746, § 22.* The juvenile must have been at least ten years old and less than seventeen years of age when the conduct occurred. *See Fam. Code § 51.02(2)* (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Upon review, we find the submitted information does not involve a juvenile suspect, offender, or defendant engaging in delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision for the purposes of section 58.008(b). Thus, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 58.008.

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. 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). Upon review, 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 the information we have marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Section 552.130 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<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,

Chase D. Young  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CDY/eb

---

<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).

<sup>2</sup> We note the remaining information contains 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).

Mr. Nico Arias - Page 4

Ref: ID# 953976

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)