



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 28, 2022

Sergeant Mirabelle Garza
Pharr Police Department
P.O. Box 1729
Pharr, Texas 78577

OR2022-29970

Dear Ms. Garza:

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# 972043 (ORR# P002384).

The Pharr Police Department (the "department") received a request for four specified incident reports. The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the department claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). The department states it "has closed investigations into several criminal offenses" and informs us "each case was closed with on [sic] arrest, conviction, or deferred adjudication." However, the department also argues, "As a result of the confidential nature and ongoing investigations of the incident and the requested information," the department should withhold the information. In light of these representations, we are unable to determine whether the submitted reports relate to ongoing criminal cases or to closed cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Additionally, we find the department has failed to establish these arguments are complementary as contemplated by the court of appeals in *City of Carrollton v. Paxton*, 490 S.W.3d 187, 196 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, pet. denied). Thus, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) to the information at

issue. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.108(a)(2) 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.”¹ Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of 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.). Thus, with the exception of the requestor’s date of birth, to which the requestor has a right of access pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code, the department must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *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 herself). The department must release the remaining information to this requestor.²

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/jm

¹ 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).

² 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 department receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a decision from this office.

Ref: ID# 972043

c: Requestor