



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 21, 2022

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
315 South Santa Rosa, 6th Floor
San Antonio, Texas 78207

OR2022-36261

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 985888 (Reference# W471487).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for specified police reports. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.152 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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;

¹ We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(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)-(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. *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 information at issue involves juvenile offenders, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.008 apply; therefore, the city must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] 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). Upon review, we find the information at issue was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect. *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), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, the information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. You have not indicated the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that

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

assumption, we conclude the city must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.

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). You state the information at issue relates to a pending investigation or prosecution. Based on your representation and our review, we find 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 marked.

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). You state the information at issue pertains to a concluded investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information you marked.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes, among other items, the identities of investigating officers and the identity of the complainant, but does not include the identity of a victim who is not the complainant. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(a)(1) and section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.³

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

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

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). We note one of the reports at issue contains identifying information of a sexual assault victim. Upon review, we find most of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the identifying information of the sexual assault victim and the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* ORD 208 at 1-2.

You state portions of the information at issue identify a complainant who reported violations of law to the city's police department. Based upon the city's representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

Section 552.152 of the Government Code provides,

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from [required public disclosure] if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.152. The city represents the release of the undercover officers' identities would subject the officers to a substantial threat of physical harm. Therefore, we find section 552.152 is applicable to the identities of the undercover officers within the information at issue. Accordingly, the city must withhold the identifying information of the undercover officers, which it marked, under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(a)(1) and section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the identifying information of the sexual assault victim and the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The city must withhold the identifying information of the undercover officers, which it marked, under section 552.152 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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,

Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/jxd

Mr. James Kopp - Page 6

Ref: ID# 985888

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)