



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 7, 2014

Ms. Lisa D. Mares
Counsel for City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2014-17918

Dear Ms. Lindsay:

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# 539207 (McKinney ID Nos. 10-11228 & 10-11335).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for all incident reports pertaining to a specified address during specified time periods. The city states it will redact information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and under section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note 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* 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 id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find the information we have marked was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse; thus, this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201 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), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). As the city does not indicate the city’s police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, and based on our review, we determine the information at issue is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c). Section 58.007 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise,

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

- (1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;
- (2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and
- (3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age when the conduct occurred. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Upon review, we conclude the information we have marked consists of law enforcement records involving juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision occurring after September 1, 1997, and is, therefore, subject to section 58.007(c). *See id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of section 58.007). None of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply. Therefore, the information we have marked is confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.³

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455* (1987). This office has also held common-law privacy protects the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. *See Open Records Decision No. 394* (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201.

We note the common-law right to privacy is a personal right that “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded.” *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded that, generally, only that information which either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. Open Records Decision No 393 at 2 (1983); *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information); ORD 440 (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). In this instance, the city seeks to withhold the entirety of the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the information at issue must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. However, upon review, we find some of the information at issue identifies alleged sexual assault victims, and therefore satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Further, we find the additional information we have marked otherwise satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the additional information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information pertaining to an identified individual. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) 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). The city states the information in Exhibit B-3 relates to an open and pending criminal investigation. Upon

review, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. See *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue.

Section 552.108, however, 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*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit B-3 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code, in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code, and in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit B-3 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID#539207

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)