



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 17, 2022

Mr. Kevin Bailey
Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2022-24612

Dear Mr. Bailey:

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# 966162 (ORR# M037328-052422).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for all records involving the requestor's minor child. You claim some of the information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. You further claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section 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. 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. You claim the instant request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records. However, we note the requestor has a right of access to otherwise private information pertaining to her minor child pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). We note you have submitted information related to incidents involving the requestor's minor child. Accordingly, the city may not withhold this information from this requestor as a compilation under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

(b) 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 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.

...

(d) Law enforcement records concerning a child may be inspected or copied by:

...

(4) the child's parent or guardian[.]

...

(e) Before a child or a child's parent or guardian may inspect or copy a record concerning the child under Subsection (d), the custodian of the record shall redact:

- (1) any personally identifiable information about a juvenile suspect, offender, victim, or witness who is not the child; and
- (2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act] or any other law.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b), (d)(4), (e); *see id.* § 51.03(a) (defining “delinquent conduct” 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. The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See id.* § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). The submitted information involves juvenile offenders, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). In this instance, however, the requestor is a parent or guardian of one of the juvenile offenders. Thus, the requestor has a right to inspect juvenile law enforcement records concerning this juvenile pursuant to section 58.008(d) of the Family Code. *See id.* § 58.008(d). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. However, section 58.008(e)(1) provides any personally identifiable information about a juvenile suspect, offender, victim, or witness who is not the requestor’s child must be redacted. *See id.* § 58.008(e)(1). Thus, the city must withhold the personally identifiable information of the other juvenile offender in Exhibit C, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(e)(1) of the Family Code.¹ *Id.* § 58.008(d), (e)(1). Further, section 58.008(e)(2) provides that information subject to any other exception to disclosure under the Act or other law must also be redacted. *See id.* § 58.008(e)(2). Thus, we will consider your remaining arguments against release of the submitted information.

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.

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Id. § 261.201(a). You assert the remaining information in Exhibits C, D, and E is confidential under section 261.201. However, we find you have not established this information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code or consists of a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect. *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). Therefore, the remaining information at issue is not confidential under section 261.201(a) of the Family Code and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state Exhibits C, D, and E pertain to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to Exhibits C, D, and E.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state Exhibit B pertains to closed criminal cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to Exhibit B.

However, we note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold Exhibits C, D, and E under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.²

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information, including the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted video recordings. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *See Indus. Found*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining basic information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released to this requestor, the city may withhold Exhibits C, D, and E under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. In releasing the basic information, the city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(e)(1) of the Family Code.³

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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/mo

Ref: ID# 966162

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ We note the requestor has a right of access to the basic information being released. *See* Fam. Code § 58.008(d); *See also* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).