



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 8, 2008

Ms. Cheryl K. Byles
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2008-10835

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# 318249.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for a specified report. You state that you have redacted Texas motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 of the Government Code pursuant to the previous determinations issued to the city in Open Records Letter Nos. 2006-14726 (2006) and 2007-00198 (2007). *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001). You also state that you are withholding social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ 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 552.108 of the Government Code 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[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body must reasonably explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information

¹Section 552.147(b) 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.

at issue. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state, and provide documentation showing, that the submitted information is related to a pending criminal prosecution. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, 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. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases).

We note, however, that 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*. *See* 531 S.W.2d 177; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Basic information includes the identity and description of the complainant. You argue that since the submitted information pertains to a sexual assault, the basic information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of 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.

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). Although you argue that the remaining information should be withheld in its entirety, you have not demonstrated, and the report does not reflect, a situation in which all of the remaining information must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Furthermore, we note that the submitted written report

uses a pseudonym and not the victim's real name. We note that use of a pseudonym by the victim sufficiently protects the victim's privacy. Therefore, none of the basic information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on these grounds.

You further assert that the basic information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy upon a showing of "special circumstances." See Open Records Decision No. 169 (1977). This office considers "special circumstances" to refer to a very narrow set of situations in which release of the information would likely cause someone to face "an imminent threat of physical danger." *Id.* at 6. "Special circumstances" do not include "a generalized and speculative fear of harassment or retribution." *Id.* We find that you have failed to demonstrate that release of the basic information would cause an imminent threat of physical danger. Accordingly, you have not shown special circumstances sufficient to justify withholding any of the submitted information from public disclosure. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy based on "special circumstances."

In summary, the city must release basic information in accordance with section 552.108(c) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the rest of the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Benjamin A. Diener
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BAD/jb

Ref: ID# 318249

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Stella Nabors
1316 Limerick Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76134
(w/o enclosures)