



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 24, 2013

Ms. Michelle M. Kretz
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2013-12734

Dear Ms. Kretz:

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# 494006 (City PIR No. W025700).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all records pertaining to a named individual from a specified period of time, including information pertaining to a specified incident. You state you are releasing some of the requested information. We understand the city will redact the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers pursuant to Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-15641 (2011) and 2011-15956 (2011) and certain motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under

¹Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-15641 and 2011-15956 are previous determinations issued to the city authorizing the city to withhold the originating telephone numbers and addresses, respectively, of 9-1-1 callers furnished to the city by a service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code, without requesting a decision from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code). Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., S.B. 458, § 1 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.130(c)). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(d), (e).

section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2012-10083 (2012). We understand the law, facts, and circumstances on which the previous ruling was based have not changed. Therefore, to the extent the information at issue is identical to the information ruled on in the previous ruling, we conclude the city must rely on Open Records Letter No. 2012-10083 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). As you state the submitted information was not previously ruled upon, we will address the submitted arguments against disclosure.

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 common-law right to privacy, which protects information if it (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 met. *Id.* at 681-82. A compilation of an individual’s criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual’s criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning a named individual and implicates this individual’s right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note you have submitted information in which the named individual is not depicted as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Information that refers to the named individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not private as criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses common-law privacy. Common-law privacy is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. The type of information considered intimate or 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.* Upon review, we agree the information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the remaining information at issue 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sarah Casterline', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 494006

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)