



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 3, 2006

Ms. Katherine M Powers
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law and Police Division
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar Street, #300A
Dallas, Texas 75215-1801

OR2006-04512

Dear Ms. Powers:

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# 248019.

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for all 9-1-1, disturbance, and domestic violence calls regarding the requestor and a named individual. You claim that the submitted 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.

Initially, we must address the department's obligations under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, a governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (b). You inform us that the department received the present request on February 2, 2006. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until February 28, 2006. *See* Gov't Code § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we find that the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason

exists for withholding the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally speaking, a compelling reason exists when third party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will address your argument regarding this section.

Section 552.101 excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy, which 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. This office has also found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under constitutional or common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982).

Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated that the requestor knows the identity of the individual whose privacy is implicated, as well as the nature of the relevant incident, all the information at issue must be withheld to protect that individual's privacy. You argue that the submitted information should be withheld in its entirety. However, upon review of the information, we are unable to conclude that the requestor knows the nature of the incident at issue. Thus, we conclude the submitted information may not be withheld in its entirety on the basis of common law privacy. Nevertheless, we find that portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, are confidential under common law privacy and must generally be withheld under section 552.101.

We note, however, that the requestor appears to be the spouse of the individual to whom the submitted information pertains. If so, the requestor may have a special right of access to the

submitted information as the authorized representative of the individual to whom it pertains. See Gov't Code § 552.023; Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). If the requestor has a right of access to the submitted information under section 552.023, then the department may not withhold any of this information from the requestor on privacy grounds under section 552.101, and must release the submitted information in its entirety. If the requestor does not have a special right of access to the submitted information, then the department must withhold the information we have marked under common law privacy in conjunction with section 552.101, but must release the remaining information.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Vela III". The signature is stylized with a large initial "J" and a long horizontal flourish at the end.

José Vela III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JV/krl

Ref: ID# 248019

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Stephen Potts
7720 McCallum Blvd., #1061
Dallas, Texas 75252
(w/o enclosures)