



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 7, 2007

Mr. Miguelangel Matos
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal, P.C.
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212

OR2007-14631

Dear Mr. Matos:

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# 294427.

The City of Jourdanton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a specified murder investigation. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that the submitted information contains a document filed with a court, which is expressly public under section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. Such information must be released unless it is expressly confidential under other law. You claim that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.108 are discretionary exceptions that protect a governmental body's interests and are therefore not "other law" for purposes of section 552.022(a)(17). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103), 586 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the court-filed document under section 552.103 or section 552.108. We note that information that has been filed with a court is not protected by common-law privacy. *See Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992)

(common-law privacy not applicable to court-filed document). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the court-filed information based on section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Therefore, the court-filed document, which we have marked, must be released to the requestor.

We next address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information. Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(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 [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(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)-(b). Generally, subsections 552.108(a)(1) and 552.108(b)(1) are mutually exclusive of subsections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2). Section 552.108(a)(1) protects information, the release of which would interfere with a particular pending criminal investigation or prosecution, while section 552.108(b)(1) encompasses internal law enforcement and prosecution records, the release of which would interfere with on-going law enforcement and prosecution efforts in general. In contrast, sections 552.108(a)(2) and (b)(2) protect information that relates to a concluded criminal investigation or prosecution that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state, and provide documentation showing, that the submitted information relates to a pending

criminal case. Based on this representation, we conclude that the release of the remaining 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 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e.*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable.

However, 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 *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic front page offense and arrest information, the city may withhold the remaining information from disclosure based on section 552.108(a)(1).¹

You claim that the basic information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101. 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 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. Upon review, we find that the remaining information is not intimate or embarrassing and is of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

You assert that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.147 of the Government Code, which provides that “[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from” required public disclosure under the Act. The city may withhold the social security number we have marked under section 552.147.²

¹We note that basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

²We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

In summary, the court-filed document, which we have marked, must be released to the requestor pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the marked social security number under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The remaining basic information must be released.

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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 294427

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Donna Williams
P.O. Box 882
Uvalde, Texas 78802
(w/o enclosures)