



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 7, 2022

Mr. David V. Overcash  
Counsel for the City of Anna  
Wolfe Tidwell & McCoy, L.L.P.  
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 300  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-27241

Dear Mr. Overcash:

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# 971134 (ORR# W003919).

The City of Anna (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to two named individuals, including a specified incident. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the procedural obligations of the city under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The city informs us it received the request for information on June 7, 2022. Thus, the city's ten-business-day deadline to request a ruling was June 21, 2022. However, the envelope containing the request for a ruling from this office does not have a postmark. *See* Gov't Code § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). We note this office received the request for ruling on July 6, 2022. Therefore, we find the city has failed to establish it complied with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301.

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). Because common-law privacy can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address its applicability to the information at issue. However, we find the city has failed to establish a compelling reason to address its remaining arguments.

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, in part, for unspecified information held by the city concerning a named individual. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individual 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 of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. The requestor also asks for information pertaining to a specified arrest. Because the requestor specifically asks for this information, it is not part of a compilation of the individual's criminal history. Thus, this information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground. Accordingly, the city must release the information at issue.

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/mo

Ref: ID# 971134

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)