



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 19, 2022

Mr. William P. Chesser
Attorney at Law
Counsel for the City of Coleman
P.O. Box 983
Brownwood, Texas 76804

OR2022-20931

Dear Mr. Chesser:

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# 956620.

The City of Keene (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to two named individuals. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note it appears the city has not submitted a portion of the reports at issue. The city does not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, it has been authorized to withhold any such information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). Because we can discern the nature of the information that has been redacted, being deprived of it does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling in this instance. Nevertheless, be advised a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering that the redacted information be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D)

¹ We note the city did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code regarding some of the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). Nevertheless, sections 552.101 and 552.130 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301. The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987). Thus, we will consider whether the submitted information must be withheld on those grounds.

(governmental body must provide this office with copy of “specific information requested”), .302.

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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. 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. The requestor asks for all information held by the city concerning two named individuals. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement information depicting either of the named individuals 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 list either named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Thus, this information does not consist of compilations of the named individuals’ criminal histories, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

[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 some of the information at issue, which we have marked, was used or developed in an investigation by the city’s police department

(the “department”) 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 the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such rule exists. Given that assumption, the city must withhold the information we have marked 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).*

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator’s accident report), .062 (officer’s accident report). An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). However, a governmental entity shall release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). *Id.* § 550.065(c), (c-1). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c). The submitted information contains a CR-3 accident report that is subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. The requestor is not a person listed under section 550.065(c). Thus, the city must withhold the submitted accident report under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy,” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find none of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual’s privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the remaining information is not confidential under constitutional privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

As discussed above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. 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.). The city must withhold the submitted date of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. The city must withhold the driver's license number and issuing state in the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement records depicting any of the named individuals 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 following: (1) the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code; (2) the submitted accident report under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code; (3) the submitted date of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (4) the driver's license number and issuing state in the remaining information 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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jm

Ref: ID# 956620

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)