



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 3, 2008

Ms. Cheryl K. Byles  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2008-07534

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# 311607.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to 9-1-1 calls made during a specific time and date, including a call log detailing the types of calls made, the callers, and the callers' telephone numbers. You claim that a portion of the submitted 9-1-1 call log 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.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communications districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code are applicable to emergency 9-1-1 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These sections make the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a 9-1-1 service provider confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 860,000.

You state that the city is part of an emergency communications district established under section 772.218. You assert that the information that you have highlighted was furnished by a 9-1-1 service provider. Based on your representations, we conclude that the city must withhold the highlighted telephone numbers and addresses under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code. We note, however, that the identification of the callers and the information pertaining to intersections does not constitute an originating telephone number or address for purposes of section 772.218. Thus, section 772.218 is not applicable to that information, which we have marked for release.

Section 552.101 also encompasses common-law 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). In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded that information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983); *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). We have marked the name of an alleged victim of sexual assault that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the remaining information that the city highlighted, which consists of the call type, is not intimate or embarrassing information; thus, it may not be withheld under common-law privacy and must instead be released.

In summary, in conjunction with section 552.101, the city must withhold the highlighted telephone numbers and addresses under section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code and the information we have marked under common-law privacy. 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,



Allan D. Meesey  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ADM/mcf

Ref: ID# 311607

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Kerry Robinson  
409 Stone Mountain Court  
Cresson, Texas 76035  
(w/o enclosures)