



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 17, 2010

Ms. LeAnn M. Quinn
City Secretary
City of Cedar Park
600 North Bell Boulevard
Cedar Park, Texas 78613

OR2010-17414

Dear Ms. Quinn:

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# 400288 (Reference Number 10-654).

The City of Cedar Park (the "city") received a request for a specified police report. You state you will make a portion of the requested information available to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information involves an alleged violation of section 32.51 of the Penal Code, which provides that "[a] person commits an offense if the person, with the intent to harm or defraud another, obtains, possesses, transfers, or uses . . . identifying information of another person without the other person's consent[.]" Penal Code § 32.51(b)(1). For purposes of section 32.51, "identifying information" includes an individual's name and financial institution account number. *Id.* § 32.51(a)(1)(A), (C). Article 2.29 of the Code of Criminal Procedure pertains to alleged violations of section 32.51 that occurred on or after September 1, 2005 and provides as follows:

(a) A peace officer to whom an alleged violation of Section 32.51, Penal Code, is reported shall make a written report to the law enforcement agency that employs the peace officer that includes the following information:

- (1) the name of the victim;
- (2) the name of the suspect, if known;
- (3) the type of identifying information obtained, possessed, transferred, or used in violation of Section 32.51, Penal Code; and
- (4) the results of any investigation.

(b) On the victim's request, the law enforcement agency shall provide the report created under Subsection (a) to the victim. In providing the report, the law enforcement agency shall redact any otherwise confidential information that is included in the report, other than the information described by Subsection (a).

Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.29. For purposes of article 2.29, an offense is committed on or after September 1, 2005, if no "element of the offense occurs before that date." Act of June 17, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., ch. 294, § 1(b), 2005 Tex. Gen. Laws 885. In this instance, the submitted report pertains to forgery, which constitutes an alleged violation of section 32.51. The requestor is the victim of the alleged identity theft listed in the report, and the alleged offense occurred after September 1, 2005. Therefore, the submitted report is subject to article 2.29 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and must be released to the requestor, except to the extent that it contains confidential information. *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.29. You seek to withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. As a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Therefore, the submitted report may not be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, we note section 552.137 of the Government Code is applicable to portions of the submitted report.¹ As this exception is a confidentiality provision, we will address its applicability to the submitted information.

Section 552.137 states that "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code,

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

unless its owner affirmatively consents to its disclosure.² As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the remaining information must be released to this requestor.³

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/eeg

Ref: ID# 400288

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

³We note that because the requestor has a special right of access to this information in this instance, if the city receives another request for this information from an individual other than this requestor, the city should again seek a decision from this office.