



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 12, 2014

Ms. Linda Hight
Records Coordinator
City of Cleburne
P.O. Box 677
Cleburne, Texas 76033

OR2014-22567

Dear Ms. Hight:

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# 546719.

The City of Cleburne (the "city") received a request for the suicide note from report number 13-03970, and the photographs of injuries from report number 14-0078. You claim the submitted responsive 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 "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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated that the requestor knows the identity

of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. Additionally, we note the public has a legitimate interest in knowing the general details of a crime. *See generally* *Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting a "legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity" (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994))). In this instance, the request reveals that the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of the information pertaining to report number 13-03970. Therefore, withholding only the individual's identity or certain details of the incident from the requestor would not preserve the subject individual's common-law right of privacy. Accordingly, to protect the privacy of the individual to whom the information relates, the city must generally withhold Exhibit 2 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the requestor identifies herself as an employee of the Child Protective Services Division of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. The interagency transfer doctrine provides that information may be transferred between governmental bodies without violating its confidential character on the basis of a recognized need to maintain an unrestricted flow of information between governmental bodies. *See* Attorney General Opinion No. GA-0055 (2003); Open Records Decision Nos. 680 at 7 (2003), 667 at 3-4 (2000). However, an interagency transfer of confidential information is prohibited where a confidentiality statute enumerates specific entities to which release of confidential information is authorized, and the requesting agency is not among the statute's enumerated entities. *See* Attorney General Opinion DM-353 at 4 n.6 (1995); Open Records Decision No. 661 at 3 (1999).

Common-law privacy is not a confidentiality statute that enumerates specific entities to which release of the confidential information is authorized. Furthermore, we note that release pursuant to the interagency transfer doctrine does not constitute a release of information to the public for the purposes of section 552.007 of the Act. *See, e.g.*, Attorney General Opinions H-917 at 1 (1976), H-242 at 4 (1974); *see also* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352. Thus, the city does not waive its interests in withholding this information by exercising its discretion under the interagency transfer doctrine.

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# 546719

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)