



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 2, 2012

Ms. Delietrice Henry
Open Records Assistant
Plano Police Department
P.O. Box 860358
Plano, Texas 75086-0358

OR2012-10106

Dear Ms. Henry:

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# 458044 (ORR #s COSL041112 and WILL050212).

The Plano Police Department (the "department") received two requests from different requestors for a specified report. The second requestor also seeks another specified report, which you state has been released. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception 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 the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (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 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. In Open Records Decision No. 393, this office

concluded 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; 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 (1983); *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). Further, in those instances where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the victim, the entire report must be withheld to protect the victim's privacy.

We note the submitted report reflects that the second requestor knows the identity of the alleged sexual assault victim listed in the submitted report. Therefore, withholding only the individual's identity from the second requestor would not preserve the individual's common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, to protect the individual's privacy, the department must withhold the submitted report in its entirety from the second requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the first request does not reflect the first requestor knows the identity of the alleged sexual assault victim listed in the report. Thus, the submitted report need not be withheld in its entirety from the first requestor on the basis of common-law privacy. However, we find portions of the submitted report are highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the department must withhold from the first requestor the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department has failed to demonstrate, however, how the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information from the first requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional 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 (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 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs."

Id. at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or otherwise implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the department may not withhold this information under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the submitted report in its entirety from the second requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold from the first requestor the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released to the first requestor.

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/som

Ref: ID# 458044

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)