



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 13, 2008

Mr. C. Patrick Phillips  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2008-15635

Dear Mr. Phillips:

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# 328268.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for a specified incident 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. 2007-00198 (2007) and 2006-14726 (2006). *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 pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the submitted 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 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 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.

concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (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 addition, this office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps).

The submitted report relates to an alleged sexual assault. Generally, only the 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; however, a governmental body is required to withhold an entire report when identifying information is inextricably intertwined with other releasable information or when the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. See Open Records Decisions Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982); see also Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986). In this instance, you inform us that the requestor knows the identity of the victim of the alleged sexual assault. Thus, the release of any portion of the report would not preserve the victim's common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, we conclude the city must withhold the submitted report in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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,



Matt Entsminger  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MRE/jb

Ref: ID# 328268

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Frances T. Ayala  
3525 Marquita Drive  
Fort Worth, Texas 76116  
(w/o enclosures)