



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 17, 2014

Mr. John Ohnemiller
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2014-16456

Dear Mr. Ohnemiller:

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# 536394 (Midland ID# 14590).

The Midland Police Department (the "department") received a request from an investigator with the Texas Education Agency (the "TEA") for all offense, incident, and investigative reports regarding a named individual, including witness statements and confessions and a specified case. You claim 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. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code. Section 261.201 provides as follows:

(a) Except as provided by Section 261.203, the following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] 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). Upon review, we find the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged child abuse. *See id.* § 261.001 (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code 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). Therefore, we find the submitted information is within the scope of section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. You have not indicated the department has adopted rules governing the release of this type of information; therefore, we assume no such regulations exist. Accordingly, we conclude the submitted information is generally confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

However, section 261.201 of the Family Code also provides information encompassed by subsection (a) may be disclosed “for purposes consistent with [the Family Code] and applicable federal or state law.” *Id.* § 261.201(a). As noted above, the requestor is an investigator with the TEA, which has assumed the duties of the State Board for Educator Certification (the “SBEC”).¹ The requestor claims section 22.082 of the Education Code gives the SBEC a right to the requested information and states the requested information is related to an SBEC investigation of an individual who has applied for or currently holds educator credentials.² Section 22.082 of the Education Code provides the SBEC “may obtain from any law enforcement or criminal justice agency all criminal history record information and all records contained in any closed criminal investigation file that relate to a specific applicant for or holder of a certificate issued under Subchapter B, Chapter 21.” Educ. Code § 22.082. You state the case at issue is closed. Thus, as the submitted information consists of a closed criminal investigation of an applicant for or a holder of a certificate issued under subchapter B, Chapter 21 of the Education Code, we find section 22.082 of the Education Code gives the TEA a statutory right of access to the submitted information in its entirety. *See id.*; *cf. Brookshire v. Houston Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 508 S.W.2d 675, 678-79 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1974, no writ) (when legislature defines term in one statute and uses same term in relation to same subject matter in latter statute, later use of term is same as previously defined).

¹The 79th Texas legislature passed House Bill 1116, which required the transfer of SBEC’s administrative functions and services to TEA, effective September 1, 2005.

²The requestor also claims a right to the information at issue under sections 261.308 and 261.406 of the Family Code. However, these statutes apply to information held by the Department of Family and Protective Services and not the department. *See* Fam. Code §§ 261.308, .406.

However, section 261.201(a) states the release must be “for purposes consistent with the Family Code.” *See* Fam. Code § 261.201(a). This office cannot determine whether release of the submitted information is consistent with the Family Code. Consequently, if the department determines release of the submitted information is not consistent with the Family Code, then the department must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.201(b)-(g), (i), (k) (listing circumstances under which section 261.201 information can be released). If the department determines release of the submitted information is consistent with the Family Code, then section 261.201 does not prohibit the release of the submitted information to the requestor in this case. *Id.* Therefore, the department may not withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. Nevertheless, in that situation, we must consider whether the submitted information is otherwise excepted from disclosure.

We note the submitted information contains information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code, which 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.³ Gov’t Code § 552.130(a)(1). Upon review, we find the motor vehicle record information we marked is generally confidential under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Because the remaining information includes confidential information under section 552.130 of the Government Code, we must consider whether the requestor in this case, as a TEA investigator, may nevertheless obtain the information at issue. Because section 22.082 of the Education Code authorizes the requestor to obtain information in its entirety, while section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure portions of the remaining information, we find section 22.082 is in conflict with section 552.130 of the Government Code. Where information falls within both a general and specific provision of law, the specific provision prevails over the general. *See Horizon/CMS Healthcare Corp. v. Auld*, 34 S.W.3d 887, 901 (Tex. 2000) (“more specific statute controls over the more general”); *Cuellar v. State*, 521 S.W.2d 277 (Tex. Crim. App. 1975) (under well-established rule of statutory construction, specific statutory provisions prevail over general ones); Open Records Decision No. 451 (1986). Although section 22.082 of the Education Code generally allows a TEA investigator access to files of a closed criminal investigation, section 552.130 of the Government Code specifically protects motor vehicle record information. This section specifically permits release to certain parties and in circumstances that do not include the TEA representative’s request in this instance. Therefore, we conclude, notwithstanding section 22.082, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information in the submitted information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, if the department determines the release of the submitted information is not consistent with the Family Code, then the submitted information must be withheld from the requestor in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. If the department determines the release of information is consistent with the Family Code, then the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code and must release the remaining information to this requestor pursuant to section 22.082 of the Education Code.⁴

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,



Lauren Dahlstein
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LMD/som

Ref: ID# 536394

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴As noted, the requestor has a special right of access, beyond that of the general public, to any information being released in this instance. Therefore, if the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, it must again seek a ruling from this office.