



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 19, 2012

Mr. George E. Hyde
Counsel for the City of Carrollton
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal, P.C.
2500 West William Cannon, Suite 609
Austin, Texas 78745

OR2012-18634

Dear Mr. Hyde:

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# 471708.

The City of Carrollton and the Carrollton Police Department (collectively the "city"), which you represent, received a request for any computer-assisted-dispatch ("CAD") notes, offense reports, and/or arrest reports for a specified time and place. You indicate some of the requested information does not exist.¹ 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 552.108(b)(2) excepts from disclosure "[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(2). Subsection 552.108(b)(2) protects internal

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App. — San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

law enforcement and prosecution records that relate to a concluded criminal investigation or prosecution that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body claiming an exception under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the exception it claims is applicable to the information the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt* 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the submitted information relates to an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Accordingly, we agree that section 552.108(b)(2) is 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 Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). In this instance, the information at issue consists of a CAD report. In Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996), this office concluded information contained in a CAD report is substantially the same as basic information. *See* ORD 649 at 3; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 394 at 3 (1983) (there is no qualitative difference between information contained in radio cards or radio logs and front-page offense report information expressly held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*; thus, such information is generally public). Therefore, except for basic information under section 552.108(c), the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code.

You claim some of the basic information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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 exception 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). 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. This office has also 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 No. 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Upon review, we find the information you have marked, as well as the additional information we have marked, is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Thus, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception. For many years, this office determined section 552.101, in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy, protected information from disclosure when “special circumstances” exist in which the disclosure of information would place an individual in imminent danger of physical harm. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 169 (1977) (special circumstances required to protect information must be more than mere desire for privacy or generalized fear of harassment or retribution), 123 (1976) (information protected by common-law right of privacy if disclosure presents tangible physical danger). However, the Texas Supreme Court has held freedom from physical harm does not fall under the common-law right to privacy. *Tex. Dep’t of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. & Hearst Newspapers, L.L.C.*, 343 S.W.3d 112, 117 (Tex. 2011) (“freedom from physical harm is an independent interest protected under law, untethered to the right of privacy”). Instead, in the *Cox* decision, the court recognized for the first time a separate common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure that exists independent of the common-law right to privacy. *Id.* at 118. Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, “information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm.” *Id.* In applying this new standard, the court noted “deference must be afforded” law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned, “vague assertions of risk will not carry the day.” *Id.* at 119.

You argue the disclosure of the submitted information would likely cause the requestor’s neighbor to face an imminent threat of physical danger. Upon review, however, we conclude you have not demonstrated that release of the remaining information would subject the requestor’s neighbor to a specific risk of harm. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code. In releasing basic information, the city must withhold the information you have marked, as well as the additional information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining basic information must be released.

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,



Thana Hussaini
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 471708

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)