



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 24, 2008

Ms. Christine Womble  
Assistant District Attorney  
Frank Crowley Courts Bldg.  
133 North Industrial Boulevard, LB-19  
Dallas, Texas 75207-4399

OR2008-08555

Dear Ms. Womble:

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# 313770.

The Dallas County District Attorney (the "district attorney") received a request for a copy of the district attorney's file related to two specified cases. You state that the district attorney does not have one of the specified case files; however, information pertaining to that file is contained within the submitted case file.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> 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." Gov't

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

<sup>2</sup>We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. 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, 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); *see also id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Fam. Code ch. 261). Because the requested documents were used or developed in an investigation of child abuse, the documents are within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. You have not indicated that the district attorney has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume that no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we find that the submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code and is generally excepted from public disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, section 261.201 of the Family Code also provides that information encompassed by subsection (a) may be disclosed “for purposes consistent with [the Family Code] and applicable federal or state law.” *Id.*

We note that Exhibit C-3 consists of information relating to a polygraph examination. Access to information obtained during the course of a polygraph examination is governed by section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which is also encompassed by section 552.101, and constitutes “applicable state law” for purposes of section 261.201(a). Section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code provides in relevant part:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

(1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee[.]

Occ. Code § 1703.306. In this instance, the requestor is the authorized representative of the polygraph examinee. Thus, if the district attorney determines that disclosure of the

information is consistent with chapter 261 of the Family Code in this instance, then we find that the district attorney has the discretion to release the polygraph information of the requestor's client, which we have marked, pursuant to section 1703.306(a)(1). *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 9 (1987) (predecessor to section 1703.306 permits, but does not require, examination results to be disclosed to examinees). With the exception of this information, the district attorney must withhold the remaining information from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

However, if the district attorney determines that disclosure of the information is not consistent with chapter 261 of the Family Code, then the district attorney must withhold the submitted information in its entirety pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.<sup>3</sup> *See* Fam. Code § 261.201(b)-(g) (listing entities authorized to receive section 261.201 information); *see also* Attorney General Opinions DM-353 at 4 n. 6 (1995) (finding interagency transfer of information prohibited where confidentiality statute enumerates specific entities to which release of information is authorized and where potential receiving governmental body is not among statute's enumerated entities), JM-590 at 4-5 (1986); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (construing predecessor statute). As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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

---

<sup>3</sup>We note, however, that if the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services has created a file on this incident, the child's parent(s) may have the statutory right to review that file. *See* Fam. Code § 261.201(g).

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,



Jordan Hale  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JH/jb

Ref: ID# 313770

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Gary A. Udashen  
Sorrels, Udashen & Anton  
2301 Cedar Springs Road, Suite 400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(w/o enclosures)