



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 2, 2004

Mr. Les Moore
Police Legal Adviser
Irving Police Department
305 North O'Connor Road
Irving, Texas 75061

OR2004-4505

Dear Mr. Moore:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 202636.

The City of Irving (the "city") received a request for investigative information about an August 8, 2003, incident involving a former detention officer. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes an arrest warrant affidavit. Article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides:

The arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, *is public information*, and beginning immediately when the warrant is executed the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the warrant and the affidavit available for public inspection in the clerk's office during normal business hours. A person may request the clerk to provide copies of the warrant and affidavit on payment of the cost of providing the copies.

Code Crim. Proc. art. 15.26 (emphasis added). The exceptions found in the Public Information Act do not apply to information that is made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Decision No. 525 (1989) (statutory predecessor). Therefore, you must release the arrest warrant affidavit to the requestor if it was presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of a warrant.

We note that portions of the submitted information consists of information acquired from a polygraph examination that is confidential pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Pursuant to section 1703.306, information acquired from a polygraph examination may not be disclosed, unless it falls into one of that section's narrow exceptions. Section 1703.306 provides in part:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
- (2) the person that requested the examination;
- (3) a member, or the member's agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner's activities;
- (4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or
- (5) any other person required by due process of law.

Occ. Code § 1703.306(a). We note that the polygraph information is of the requestor's client. Accordingly, the city may only release such information, which we have marked, in accordance with section 1703.306(a)(1).

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

The submitted information consists of one report about an allegation of sexual assault. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded that, generally, only that information which either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common law privacy, because the identifying

information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983); *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also* *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 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); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). The requestor in this case knows the identity of the alleged victim of sexual assault. We believe that, in this instance, withholding only identifying information from the requestor would not preserve the victim's common law right to privacy. We conclude, therefore, that the city must withhold the remaining information pursuant to section 552.101.

In summary, the city must release the arrest warrant affidavit pursuant to article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The city may release the polygraph information only in accordance with section 1703.306(a)(1) of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the remaining information pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy.¹

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor

¹Because we resolve this issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code, we do not address your claim under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code.

should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. David Floyd
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WDF/sdk

Ref: ID# 202636

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John Haring
Lyon, Gorsky, Baskett, Haring & Gilbert
2501 Cedar Springs, Suite 750
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)