



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 6, 2011

Mr. Whitt L. Wyatt  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Richardson  
P.O. Box 831078  
Richardson, Texas 75083-1078

OR2011-06256

Dear Mr. Wyatt:

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# 416641 (ORR# 11-105).

The City of Richardson (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.130 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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 58.007 of the Family Code, which makes confidential juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. The relevant language of section 58.007 reads as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

...

(e) Law enforcement records and files concerning a child may be inspected or copied by a juvenile justice agency as that term is defined by Section 58.101, a criminal justice agency as that term is defined by Section 411.082, Government Code, the child, and the child's parent or guardian.

...

(j) Before a child or a child's parent or guardian may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (e), the custodian of the record or file shall redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, or other law.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c), (e), (j). For purposes of section 58.007(c), "child" means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age. *See id.* § 51.02(2). The information at issue involves conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03 (defining "conduct indicating a need for supervision" for purposes of Fam. Code § 58.007). Thus, this information is generally confidential under section 58.007(c). In this instance, the requestor is the attorney for the juvenile suspect listed in the submitted information. Therefore, this requestor has a right to inspect information concerning his client under section 58.007(e). *Id.* § 58.007(e). However, section 58.007(j)(2) provides information subject to any other exception to disclosure under the Act or other law must be redacted. *See id.* § 58.007(j)(2). Thus, we will address your remaining arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code for the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code. Section 261.201 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [T]he 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, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Youth Commission, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law; and

(3) the identity of the person who made the report.

*Id.* § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2)-(3). The submitted information consists of a report of alleged or suspected child abuse made to the city's police department. *See id.* § 261.001(1)(E) (definition of child abuse includes sexual assault and aggravated sexual assault under Penal

Code sections 22.011 and 22.021); *see also* Penal Code § 22.011(c)(1) (defining “child” for purposes of Penal Code sections 22.011 and 22.021 as person under 17 years of age). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. In this instance, the requestor is the attorney for the child victim listed in the information. Thus, pursuant to section 261.201(k), the information may not be withheld from this requestor on the basis of section 261.201(a). *See* Fam. Code § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(l)(3) states the identity of the reporting party shall be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(3). Further, section 261.201(l)(2) states any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Accordingly, we will consider your remaining arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code for the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. 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.

The submitted information relates to a sexual assault. Generally, only the information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). 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* ORD 393, 339; *see also* ORD 440 (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld); *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). Further, in those instances where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the victim, the entire report must generally be withheld to protect the victim’s privacy. You argue the entire report should be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy to protect the victim’s identity because the requestor knows the identity of the victim. However, as noted above, the requestor is the attorney for the individual whose privacy interests are at issue. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Thus, the requestor

has a right of access to information pertaining to his client that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information from this requestor under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

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(a)(1) 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 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information pertains to an active investigation. Based on your representation, we conclude release of the submitted 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) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the submitted information.

However, we note 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 at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information does not include the Texas motor vehicle record information encompassed by section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See id.* We further note the basic information includes the identity of the complainant, who is the reporting party in this instance. *See id.* Thus, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> In releasing the basic information, the city must withhold the identity of the reporting party under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(1)(3) of the Family Code.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure, except to note basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

<sup>2</sup>We note the information being released in this instance includes information that is confidential with respect to the general public. Therefore, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

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](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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Claire Morris Sloan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/tf

Ref: ID# 416641

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)