



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 10, 2022

Mr. Joe Zapata  
HPD Administrative Supervisor  
Houston Police Department  
1200 Travis, 10th Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002-6000

OR2022-23791

Dear Mr. Zapata:

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# 965387.

The Houston Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified case. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the date the department received the request for information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the department is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, we must address the department's obligations under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(b). You state, and provide documentation showing, the department received the

request for information on May 17, 2022. We understand the department was closed on May 30, 2022 in observance of the Memorial Day holiday. This office does not count holidays for purposes of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Thus, the department's ten-business-day deadline was June 1, 2022. However, the envelope in which the department provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was meter marked June 2, 2022. Consequently, we find the department failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 in requesting a decision.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The department claims section 552.108 of the Government Code for the submitted information. However, we find you have not established a compelling reason to address your claimed exception. Nevertheless, sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, we will address the applicability of sections 552.101 and 552.130 to the submitted information.

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. This section encompasses chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See id.* § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter E-1 or subchapter F of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter E-1 or subchapter F of the Government Code. We note Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find the submitted FBI number consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Accordingly, the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

department must withhold the FBI number in the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by 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.

*Id.* § 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 have marked consists of records relating to DNA analyses of samples collected under subchapter G of chapter 411 of the Government Code. We further note it appears this information is the result of forensic DNA analyses performed by a DNA laboratory in accordance with DPS regulations. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have 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 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 doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual's criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Additionally, this office has determined that common-law privacy protects the identities of juvenile offenders. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 58.008(b). This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). We note 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.). However, because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). Further, we note the information at issue contains the dates of birth of individuals who will be de-identified and whose privacy interests will, thus, be protected.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked and the identifiable living public citizens' dates of birth satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked, and the identifiable living public citizens' dates of birth, under section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. As discussed above, the right of privacy is a personal right that lapses at death. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; Attorney General

Opinions JM-229 (1984), H-917 (1976); ORD 272. Thus, section 552.130 is not applicable to the driver's license information of the deceased individual. Accordingly, the department must withhold the driver's license and motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and section 411.153(a) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked and the identifiable living public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the driver's license and motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department 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,

Michael Pearle  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAP/jm

Ref: ID# 965387

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup> We note the remaining 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).