



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 20, 2022

Ms. Stephanie Berry
Assistant City Attorney
City of Denton
215 East McKinney
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2022-28848

Dear Ms. Berry:

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# 972980 (ORR# R001011).

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for specified reports. 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.

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, the following:

(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:

...

(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:

...

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

Fam. Code § 58.008(b), (d)(4), (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). 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). We find Exhibit E involves a juvenile offender, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). However, the requestor is a parent of the juvenile offender at issue and has access to the information at issue pursuant to section 58.008(d). *See id.* § 58.008(d). Therefore, the city may not withhold this information from the requestor under section 552.101 on the basis of section 58.008(b). *See id.* § 58.008(d). Nevertheless, section 58.008(e)(2) 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, pursuant to section 58.008(e)(2) we will consider whether this information is otherwise excepted from disclosure. We find the remaining information does not involve a juvenile suspect, offender, or defendant engaging in delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision for the purposes of section 58.008(b). Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008 of the Family Code.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred

adjudication. Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), .301(e)(1)(A). The city states the submitted information pertains to cases that concluded in results other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Therefore, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to this information.

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 Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The requestor has a right of access to her own and her children's private pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (“[a] person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the 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 individuals request information concerning themselves). We find none of the remaining basic information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the basic information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground. Therefore, the city must release the submitted basic information, but may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.¹

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.

¹ Because the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives a request for the same information from another requestor.

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/jm

Ref: ID# 972980

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)