



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 4, 2011

Mr. Jeff Ulmann
Knight & Partners
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A-105
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2011-04599

Dear Mr. Ulmann:

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# 413448.

The City of Kyle (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for police reports relating to a specified incident involving a named individual. You claim 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.

Initially, we note you have submitted a video recording unrelated to the incident specified by the requestor. This video recording is therefore not responsive to the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

We now turn to your claim under section 552.108 of the Government Code, as it is potentially the most encompassing. Section 552.108(a)(1) 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 claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706

is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). As noted above, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *See Moore* at 491; ORD 272 at 1. The United States Supreme Court has determined, however, surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information relating to their deceased relatives. *See Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 124 S. Ct. 1570 (2004) (holding surviving family members have a right to personal privacy with respect to their close relative's death-scene images and such privacy interests outweigh public interest in disclosure). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the basic information falls within the zones of privacy or otherwise implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Thus, none of the basic information may be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy. Therefore, except for basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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,



Mack T. Harrison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MTH/em

Ref: ID# 413448

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

(Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to an open case and its release would hinder that investigation. Based on this representation and our review, we conclude the release of the information at issue 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) (court delineates law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is generally applicable to the submitted information.

However, 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* and includes a detailed description of the offense. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

You raise section 552.101 of the Government Code for the basic information. Section 552.101 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 doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). You seek to withhold the basic information in its entirety on the grounds of common-law privacy. We note, however, the named individual is deceased. Common-law privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and does not protect information relating only to a deceased individual. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). We therefore conclude the city may not withhold any portion of the responsive report under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy, which protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101