



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 15, 2022

Ms. Montana A. Anderson
Litigation & PIA Paralegal
City of Abilene
P.O. Box 60
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2022-39094

Dear Ms. Anderson:

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# 990845 (ORR# 22-).

The City of Abilene (the “city”) received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident and a specified telephone number. The city states it is withholding some of the requested information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and Open Records Letter No. 2019-32652 (2019).¹ The city claims 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 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. This section encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. See Gov’t Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor pursuant to section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Letter No. 2019-32652 authorizes the city to withhold dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without the necessity of requesting an attorney general’s decision. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001).

(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.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

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

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we find offense report number 20-06750 was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201). Thus, the submitted information is within the scope of section 261.201(a). The requestor is a parent of the child victim and this individual is not alleged to have committed the suspected abuse or neglect. Accordingly, the city may not withhold this information from the requestor on the basis of section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(l)(2) provides any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the

Act or other law must still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(1)(2). Therefore, pursuant to section 261.201(1)(2) we must determine whether this information is otherwise excepted from release under the Act.

Section 552.108(a) 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: (1) 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 information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). The city states offense report number 20-06750 relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of this information 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976).

Section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in the *Houston Chronicle* decision. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle* decision). Thus, with the exception of basic information, which the city must release, the city may withhold offense report number 20-06750 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000 and makes confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). We understand the city is part of an emergency communication district that is subject to section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. To the extent the remaining information contains the originating telephone number or address of a 9-1-1 caller furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. To the extent the remaining information does not contain the originating telephone number or address of a 9-1-1 caller provided by a 9-1-1 service supplier, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that ground.

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). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.152 of the Government Code provides the following:

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 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 release of the submitted information that identifies an undercover officer would subject the officer to a substantial threat of physical harm. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated release of the information at issue would subject the officer to a substantial threat of physical harm. Therefore, the city must withhold the name of an undercover officer in the remaining information under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which the city must release, the city may withhold offense report number 20-06750 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.² To the extent the remaining information contains the originating telephone number or address of a 9-1-1 caller furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the name of an undercover officer in the remaining information 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.

² 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/jxd

Ref: ID# 990845

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)