



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 27, 2014

Ms. Janet R. Cassels
For the City of Diboll
Cassels & Reynolds, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1626
Lufkin, Texas 75902-1626

OR2014-11063

Dear Ms. Cassels:

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# 527215.

The City of Diboll (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to two specified arrests of a named individual. You claim the requested 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.

We note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Some of the submitted information consists of court-filed documents that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(17). The city must release the information subject to subsection 552.022(a)(17) unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the city seeks to withhold this information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the court-filed documents we have marked may not be withheld under section 552.108. However, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will address the applicability of this section to the court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17). Further, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining 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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides 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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You state the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged child abuse. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree Exhibit B and the information we have marked is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of Family Code ch. 261); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). As you do not indicate the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such rule exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city

must withhold Exhibit B and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (addressing predecessor statute). However, you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(2). Furthermore, you have not established the remaining information is a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under section 261.201(a)(1). *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Fam. Code ch. 261). Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate how the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy 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 at 3-7 (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 Fajjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); Open Records Decision No. 455 at 3-7 (1987). 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). In this instance, you have not demonstrated how constitutional privacy applies to the remaining information. Consequently, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from

disclosure under [the Act].” Gov’t Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). However, section 560.002 of the Government Code provides, “[a] governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual . . . may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless . . . the individual consents to the disclosure[.]” *Id.* § 560.002(1)(A). We have marked fingerprints in the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. You do not inform us, and the submitted information does not indicate, section 560.002 permits disclosure of the fingerprint information. Therefore, the city must withhold the fingerprints we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

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[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 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 generally assert the remaining information relates to a pending criminal investigation. We note the remaining information pertains to an investigation that resulted in deferred adjudication for both of the suspects involved. Upon review, we find the city has failed to explain how the remaining information pertains to a pending criminal investigation. Accordingly, the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) to the remaining information, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.¹ Gov’t Code § 552.130(a)(1). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit B and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code and the information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision Nos.* 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 "Jennifer Luttrall". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 527215

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)