ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 4, 2005

Mr. J. David Dodd, III
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hagar & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Lincoln Plaza
500 North Akard
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2005-00085

Dear Mr. Dodd:

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# 216338.

The City of Allen (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information concerning responses by the city's police officers to calls for service to a specified address from April 1, 2004 until the present. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses confidentiality provisions such as Family Code section 58.007. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997 are confidential under section 58.007. The relevant language of section 58.007(c) reads as follows:

> (c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:
>
> > (1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

> (2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from 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 Subchapter B.

The information that we have marked involves juvenile conduct that occurred after September 1, 1997. It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply; therefore, the information that we have marked is confidential pursuant to section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. You must withhold the marked information from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 261.201(a) of the Family Code provides as follows:

> (a) The 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, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Because some of the remaining information, which we have marked, consists of files, reports, records, communications, or working papers used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261, the information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. You have not indicated that the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume that no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, the documents that we have marked accordingly are confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Therefore, the city must withhold these documents from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code as information made confidential by law.

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). 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. After reviewing your representations and the submitted information, we find that some portions of the remaining submitted information are protected from disclosure by the common law right to privacy. Accordingly, we conclude that the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with the doctrine of common law privacy.

Finally, we note that the submitted information contains information that is made confidential by section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides in relevant part:

> (a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:
>
> > (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
> >
> > (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

You must withhold the Texas driver's license numbers, vehicle identification numbers, license plate numbers and related information that we have marked under section 552.130.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with sections 58.007 and 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common law right to privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked accordingly under section 552.130. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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 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,



Cary Grace
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ECG/jev

Ref: ID# 216338

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Andrew Farris
553 Northridge Drive
Allen, Texas 75002
(w/o enclosures)