



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 27, 2008

Ms. Cheryl K. Byles  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2008-07139

Dear Ms. Byles:

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# 313726.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named person and a specified address for a specified period of time. You state that some of the requested information is being released, but claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "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 that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which

---

<sup>1</sup>You state that the city has redacted Texas motor vehicle record information pursuant to the previous determinations issued to the city in Open Records Letter Nos. 2006-14726 (2006) and 2007-00198 (2007) and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.147 (b), 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001).

would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) 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 satisfied. *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. U.S. 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. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by other statutes. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997 are confidential under section 58.007 of the Family Code. Section 58.007(c) provides as follows:

Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

- (1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;
- (2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and
- (3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapter B.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). The submitted documents contain information that involves juvenile conduct occurring after September 1, 1997. None of the exceptions in section 58.007 appears to apply. Therefore, the city must withhold Exhibit C-9 and the information we have marked in Exhibit C-8 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communications districts. Section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code applies to an emergency 9-1-1 district for a county with a population over 860,000 and established in accordance with chapter 772. Section 772.218 makes confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a service supplier. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). You indicate that the city is part of an emergency communication district that was established under section 772.218. You also state that the telephone numbers and address at issue were provided by a service provider. Thus, based on your representations and our review, we agree that the city must withhold the information you have marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code.

The city asserts that some of the remaining information 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.” 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* Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the remaining information at issue relates to pending criminal investigations or prosecutions. Based on this representation, we conclude that the release of this 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. 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).

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. Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d at 186-87. Thus, with the exception of the basic front-page offense and arrest information, the city may withhold the remaining information marked under section 552.108(a)(1).

We note that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.130 of the Government Code, which provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by a Texas agency is excepted from public release. Gov’t Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). The city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130.

To conclude, the city must withhold any law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold

Exhibit C-9 and the information marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code. The city must also withhold the information marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code and under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the remaining information marked under section 552.108 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information. As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your other arguments to withhold the information at issue.

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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/jh

Ref: ID# 313726

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Pete Collazo, Jr.  
Collazo & Associates, Inc.  
6603 Running Creek  
Arlington, Texas 76001  
(w/o enclosures)