



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2008

Mr. Mark G. Mann
Assistant City Attorney
City of Garland
P.O. Box 469002
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2008-05299

Dear Mr. Mann:

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# 311748.

The City of Garland (the "city") received a request for a specified incident report. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 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 public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is 1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and 2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). 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. *Id.* at 683.

In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded that generally only that information which either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other

sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld).

In this instance, the submitted information is related to an alleged sexual assault, and the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. We believe that, in this instance, withholding only identifying information from the requestor would not preserve the victim's common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the submitted information in its entirety pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note, however, that the requestor may be the authorized representative of the individual at issue. If the requestor is the authorized representative of the individual at issue, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information from the requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person or person's representative to whom information relates on grounds that information is considered confidential under privacy principles). If the requestor does not have a right of access to the submitted information pursuant to section 552.023, then the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In the event that the requestor is the individual's authorized representative, we will address your remaining arguments against disclosure. You assert that the information marked in red is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the information marked in red relates to an ongoing criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude that the release of the information marked in red 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, the city may withhold the information you have marked in red under section 552.108(a)(1).

Finally, you claim that the information marked in green is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. This section 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." Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1). Upon review, we agree that the city must withhold the Texas driver's license number you have marked in green under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, if the requestor is not the authorized representative of the individual at issue, the city must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, if the requestor is the authorized representative of the individual at issue, then 1) the city may withhold the information you have marked in red under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code, and 2) the city must withhold the Texas driver's license number you have marked in green under section 552.130 of the Government Code. In that instance, 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,



Bill Dobie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WJD/eeg

Ref: ID# 311748

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Dalana Wills
Law Office of Gary Schappaugh
18601 LBJ Freeway, Suite. 700
Mesquite, Texas 75150
(w/o enclosures)