



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 19, 2022

Ms. Avis D. White  
Paralegal  
City of Killeen  
P.O. Box 1329  
Killeen, Texas 76540

OR2022-28638

Dear Ms. White:

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# 973508 (ORR No. W039758).

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident involving a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses 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. This office has found 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. United States 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. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not part of a

compilation of the individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

We understand you to assert the present request seeks all records pertaining to the named individual. However, we find the requestor seeks information pertaining to a specified incident involving the named individual. Because the requestor specifically asks for this information, it is not part of a compilation of the named individual's criminal history. Thus, this information is not confidential under common-law privacy as a compilation of criminal history, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. Therefore, we will address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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

(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.

...

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

...

(3) the child[.]

...

(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:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or any other law.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b), (d)(3), (e)(2); *see also id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). We understand you to assert the submitted information is subject to section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.<sup>1</sup> 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). We find the submitted information involves a juvenile offender, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). However, the requestor is a representative of the Saint Albans Police Department (the “department”) and we understand he is an authorized representative of the juvenile offender at issue, who is now an adult. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to the information at issue pursuant to section 58.008(d). *See id.* § 58.008(d)(3). Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information from the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. *See id.* § 58.008(d). Nevertheless, section 58.008(e)(2) of the Family Code provides information that is subject to any other exception to disclosure under the Act or other law must be redacted. *See id.* § 58.008(e)(2). Thus, we will consider whether the information is otherwise excepted from disclosure.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Under the doctrine of the common-law privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. 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.). We note the requestor is an authorized representative of the named individual and thus has a right of access to the named individual’s date of birth. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, the city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth we marked 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, we note the 85th Legislature repealed this provision effective September 1, 2017. *See* Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 746, § 21, 2017 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 3173, 3178. Thus, we understand you to raise section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.

state or country.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the public citizen's date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>3</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,

Kimbell Kesling  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KK/pt

Ref: ID# 973508

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</sup> We note the information being released contains a social security number. 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).