



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 29, 2022

Mr. Jeremy Anato-Mensah
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2022-26099

Dear Mr. Anato-Mensah:

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# 969124 (COFW PIR No. P008123-061322).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident involving a named individual. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims 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. 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find the submitted information contains information that is considered highly intimate or embarrassing and is not of legitimate concern to the public. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, the entire report must be withheld to protect the

individual's privacy. In this instance, withholding only the individual's identity or certain details of the report from this requestor would not preserve the individual's common-law right of privacy. Therefore, we conclude the city must generally withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

However, we note the requestor is an investigator with the Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency ("DCSA") and indicates she is conducting a background investigation for a national security or public trust position. Executive Order Number 13869 transfers the responsibility of background investigations from the Office of Personnel Management to the Department of Defense ("DoD"). Executive Order No. 13869. The DSCA is a component of the DoD and is the primary federal entity responsible for conducting background investigation for the federal government. Exec. Order No. 13869, § 2(c)(i), (iii). As a component of a covered agency, the DSCA has a right of access to the criminal history record information ("CHRI") of state and local criminal justice agencies when it receives the consent of the individual being investigated for release of such information. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 9101(b)(1), (c); *id.* § 9101(a)(6)(A) (defining "covered agency" to include DoD). CHRI is defined as "information collected by criminal justice agencies on individuals consisting of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, indictments, informations, or other formal criminal charges, and any disposition arising therefrom, sentencing, correction supervision and release[,]" but does not include "identification information such as fingerprint records to the extent that such information does not indicate involvement in the criminal justice system." *Id.* § 9101(a)(2).

In this instance, the requestor has submitted written consent from the named individual for the release of information. Therefore, the requestor has a right of access to CHRI in pertaining to the named individual. Federal law provides the DSCA's right of access to CHRI preempts state confidentiality provisions, including the common-law right to privacy. *Id.* § 9101(b)(4) (section 9101 "shall apply notwithstanding any other provision of law of any State"); *see also English v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 496 U.S. 72, 79 (1990) (state law is preempted to extent it actually conflicts with federal law); *La. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 369, (1986) (federal agency acting within scope of its congressionally delegated authority may preempt state regulation). Accordingly, the city must release the CHRI pertaining to the named individual from the submitted information to this requestor pursuant to section 9101 of title 5 of the United States Code. The city must withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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,

Gerald A. Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/jxd

Ref: ID# 969124

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)