ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 3, 2007

Mr. Mike McMillen
Assistant City Attorney
City of Amarillo
P.O. Box 1971
Amarillo, Texas 79105-1971

OR2007-15832

Dear Mr. McMillen:

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# 296471.

The Amarillo Police Department (the "department") received a request for any records or reports pertaining to a named individual as well as several specified reports. 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.

Initially, we note that some of the information you have submitted to us for review is not responsive to the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the department is not required to release this information, which we have marked, in response to this request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd).

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. 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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find that a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note, however, that information relating to routine traffic violations is not excepted from release under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *Cf.* Gov't Code § 411.082(2)(B). Here, you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note, however, that a portion of the request concerns specifically requested reports, and thus, is not a compilation of the named individual's criminal history. Further, a portion of the remaining responsive reports concern routine traffic violations, and thus, are not a compilation of the named individual's criminal history. Therefore, to the extent the department maintains unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the department must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Common-law privacy also encompasses the specific types of information that are held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. The types 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. In addition, this office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). We have marked information that the department must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

The remaining information contains information that is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.[1] Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that "relates to...a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration

---

[1]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

issued by an agency of this state." *Id.* § 552.130. Accordingly, the department must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the department maintains any law enforcement records that depict the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the department must withhold any such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 with common-law privacy. The department must also withhold the information marked under section 552.130. The remaining 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,

Paige Savoie

Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 296471

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Charles M. Simmons
Stunz, Fonda, Kiyuna & Horton, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1565
Nyssa, Oregon 97913
(w/o enclosures)