



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 28, 2022

Ms. Aliceson Cotton
Council for City of Wylie
Abernathy Roeder Boyed Hullett
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300
McKinney, Texas 75070

OR2022-36682

Dear Ms. Cotton:

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# 986970.

The City of Wylie (the "city"), which you represent, received three requests, from the same requestor, for information pertaining to specified timeframes. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 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 information made confidential by section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides:

(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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find some of the information at issue, which we marked, was used or developed in investigations 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). As you do not indicate the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold incident reports 20228140, 22028152, 22028011, 22028122, and 22028118 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). The city has not established any of the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of or consists of a report of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Therefore, the remaining information is not confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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;

(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.

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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) applies 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). You assert some of the information at issue is subject to section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. Upon review, we find some of the information, which we marked, involves juvenile offenders, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). Accordingly, the city must withhold incident report numbers 22027844, 22027828, 22027787, 22028149, 22028160, and 22028166 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.² We find the remaining information does not constitute juvenile law enforcement records for the purposes of 58.008(b). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime; [or]

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

...

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution; [or]

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1)-(2), (b)(1)-(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the

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

information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. The city states the remaining information relates to pending investigations. However, the city also states the information relates to closed investigations that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. In light of these representations, we are unable to determine whether the information at issue relates to an ongoing criminal case or to a closed case that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Additionally, we find the city 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 city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1), section 552.108(b)(1), section 552.108(a)(2), or section 552.108(b)(2) to the remaining information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information on any of these grounds.

Section 552.101 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 *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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.). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455* (1987). Additionally, 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 not of legitimate concern to the public. Upon review, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the dates of birth of public citizens and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion 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. The city asserts portions of the remaining information identify complainants who reported violations of law to the city. Upon review, however, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information identifies a complainant who reported a violation of a criminal or civil statute for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *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 incident report numbers 22027844, 22027828, 22027787, 22028149, 22028160, and 22028166, which we marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must also withhold incident report numbers 22027844, 22027828, 22027787, 22028149, 22028160, and 22028166 under section 552.101 in conjunction with 58.008 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the dates of birth of all public citizens and information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the information we marked under section 552.130. The city must release the remaining submitted 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,

Amy Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJV/eb

Ref: ID# 986970

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)