



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 31, 2022

Mr. Theodore Stoll
Deputy City Clerk
City of Wichita Falls
P.O. Box 1431
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307

OR2022-26550

Dear Mr. Stoll:

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# 969403 (ORR# R001312-061422).

The City of Wichita Falls (the "city") received a request for eight categories of information pertaining to the requestor's client and specified policies. You state you have released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains information that was released to the press. Section 552.007 of the Government Code provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); see also Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law).* Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.007, the city may not now withhold any previously released information unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. Although you raise section 552.108 of the Government Code, this section does not prohibit the release of information or make information confidential. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver).* Therefore, this information may not be withheld

under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, because section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider your argument under this section for the information at issue.

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). The city states, and provides documentation showing, police reports 21-081441 and 21-081446 pertain to an active criminal investigation. 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 the information you indicated.

However, we note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 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). Accordingly, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however,

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

to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

The city states portions of the remaining information, if released, would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution of crime. The city argues release of the information at issue could potentially help criminals avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and undermine law enforcement efforts to effectuate laws. Based on these representations and our review, we agree the release of some of the information at issue, which we have indicated, would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.² However, we find the city has not demonstrated release of any of the remaining information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

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 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 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) (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 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Portions of the remaining information involve juvenile offenders, so as to fall within

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

the scope of section 58.008(b). It does not appear any of the exceptions in section 58.008 apply. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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.

Id. § 261.201(a). Portions of the remaining information relate to reports of alleged abuse or neglect made to the city. However, we are unable to determine the age of the victims listed in the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), (1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we must rule in the alternative. If the information at issue involves a victim who was a child at the time of the incident at issue, then the information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. In that instance, as the city does not indicate it has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.⁴ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). However, if the information at issue does not involve a victim of alleged abuse or neglect who was a child at the time of the incident at issue, then the information is not subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code and the city may not withhold the information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. In that instance, we will consider the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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.). 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) (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). However, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We note the requestor has a right of access to his client's confidential information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 552.023(a) ("person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Thus, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth not belonging to the requestor's client under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. To the extent any of the information we indicated involves a victim who was a child at the time of the incident at issue, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth not belonging to the requestor under section 552.101 of the

Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.⁵

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,

Colin Henry
Attorney
Open Records Division

CEH/mo

Ref: ID# 969403

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁵ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.