



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 29, 2008

Ms. M.. Ann Montgomery  
Assistant Ellis County and District Attorney  
1201 North Highway 77, Suite 104  
Waxahachie, Texas 75165-7832

OR2008-01303

Dear Ms. Montgomery:

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# 300894.

The Ellis County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff") received a request for a specified incident report. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Gov't Code § 552.101. 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, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we find that the sheriff has failed to demonstrate how any of the information at issue was used or developed in an investigation of abuse or neglect under chapter 261. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Fam. Code ch. 261). We therefore determine that section 261.201 is not applicable to the information at issue. Accordingly, the sheriff may not withhold any of this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

You also raise section 552.101 in conjunction with 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. *Id.* at 683.

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5; *see Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985).

You assert that release of the submitted information may implicate the privacy of unnamed third parties. Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we conclude that none of the submitted information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information for the purposes of common-law privacy. Furthermore, the sheriff has failed to demonstrate how any of the submitted information falls within the “zones of privacy” or implicates a third party’s privacy interests for the purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with either common-law or constitutional privacy.

You also assert that the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(2) excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to

a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* You state that the submitted information pertains to a closed criminal investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, based on your representations and our review, we conclude that section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the submitted information.

We note, however, that basic information, which is normally found on the front page of an offense report, is generally considered public and not excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108(c). Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Company v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). In Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996), this office concluded that information contained in Computer-Aided Dispatch (“CAD”) reports is substantially the same as basic information specifically held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* and therefore is not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.108. *See also* Open Records Decision No. 394 at 3 (1983) (there is no qualitative difference between information contained in police dispatch records or radio logs and front page offense report information expressly held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*, and thus, such information is generally public). The submitted information consists of dispatch reports; therefore, as basic information, it cannot be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. As you raise no other exception to disclosure, the submitted 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,



Jennifer Luttrall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JL/eeg

Ref: ID# 300894

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kashanda Sharp  
5168 East F.M. 875  
Waxahachie, Texas 75165  
(w/o enclosures)