



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 27, 2013

Ms. LeAnn M. Quinn  
City Secretary  
City of Cedar Park  
450 Cypress Creek Road  
Cedar Park, Texas 78613

OR2013-20679

Dear Ms. Quinn:

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# 507132 (Cedar Park Reference No. 13-957).

The Cedar Park Police Department (the "department") received a request for police records regarding a named individual. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim.

Initially, we must address the department's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). In this instance, you state the department received the request for information on September 3, 2013. Accordingly, the department's ten-business-day deadline was September 17, 2013. The envelope in which the department originally submitted its request for a ruling was returned to the department for insufficient postage and the department again mailed the required information to this office in an envelope bearing a postmark of September 18, 2013. Section 552.308 of the Government Code provides, when a submission within a specified time period is required under the Act, the time requirement is met if the submission is sent by first class mail "with postage . . . prepaid" and

the postmark date is within the required time period. *See id.* § 552.308. Because the department did not submit its request for a ruling within the required time period, we find the department failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). This statutory presumption can generally be overcome when information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3, 325 at 2 (1982). Because sections 552.101, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons for non-disclosure, we will consider the department's arguments under these sections.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "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 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82.

This office has found 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. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request seeks all reports pertaining to a named individual. This request requires the department to compile the named individual's criminal history and implicates the named individual's right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the department maintains law enforcement records listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal

defendant, the department must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>1</sup>

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](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,



Kristi L. Wilkins  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KLW/tch

Ref: ID# 507132

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.