



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 16, 2022

Ms. Aliceson Cotton
Counsel for the City of Wiley
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd, Hullett
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2022-39281

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# 991288.

The City of Wiley (the "city"), which you represent, received six requests for all police reports during a specified time frame. 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 exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you argue against release of information the city did not submit for our review. Because such information was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the city. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

(b) Except as provided in 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.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also id.* § 51.03(a) (defining “delinquent conduct” 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). Incident report numbers 22030857, 22031005, 22031115, 22031342, 22031482, 22031523, 22031478, and 22031459 involve juvenile offenders, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). It does not appear any of the exceptions in section 58.008 apply. Accordingly, we agree the city must withhold incident report numbers 22030857, 22031005, 22031115, 22031342, 22031482, 22031523, 22031478, and 22031459 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.¹ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information identifies an individual who is ten years of age or older and under the age of seventeen as a suspect or offender of delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008 of the Family Code.

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

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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.

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

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Some of the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city. *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, we find incident report numbers 22030894, 22031392, 22031015, and 22031421 are subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. In this instance, the requestor is not a parent of any of the child victims listed in the information at issue. Therefore, the city must withhold incident report numbers 22030894, 22031392, 22031015, and 22031421 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(1). Furthermore, you have not established the information is a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under section 261.201(a)(2). *See* Fam. Code § 261.001(1), (4). Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 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

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 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 *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). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F.Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 6251 (1977)); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death”). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked and the dates of birth of living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 411.083 of the Government Code which pertains to criminal history record information (“CHRI”). CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center (“NCIC”) or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means “information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable

descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions.” Gov’t Code § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990); *see generally* Gov’t Code ch. 411 subch. F. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F or subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information consists of confidential CHRI. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 on this basis.

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 license, 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 indicated, a representative sample of which we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold incident report numbers 22030857, 22031005, 22031115, 22031342, 22031482, 22031523, 22031478, and 22031459 under section

552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. The city must withhold incident report numbers 22030894, 22031392, 22031015, and 22031421 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we marked and the dates of birth of living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we indicated, a representative sample of which we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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,

Justin H. Miller
Attorney
Open Records Division

JHM/eb

Ref: ID# 991288

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)