



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 22, 2016

Mr. Renaldo Stowers
Senior Associate General Counsel
The University of North Texas System
1155 Union Circle, #310907
Denton, Texas 76203

OR2016-01702

Dear Mr. Stowers:

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# 595159 (UNT PIR No. 003575).

The University of North Texas (the "university") received a request for the arrest reports and incident reports for three specified criminal cases investigated by the university's police department (the "department"). You claim the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."

¹Although you also raise section 552.1325 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we presume you have withdrawn your claim this exception applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

²We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides:

(a) Except as provided by Section 261.203, the 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). Upon review, we find the information you have marked Representative Sample A was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the department. Accordingly, we find this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See 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), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). As you do not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume that no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the university must withhold Representative Sample A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.³

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). You provide a representation from the Denton County Criminal District Attorney's Office stating the information you have marked Representative Sample C pertains to an active criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of the information at

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 that are 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 Representative Sample C.

However, we note section 552.108 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; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes the identity of the complainant. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the university may withhold Representative Sample C under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* ORD 208 at 1-2. Additionally, the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer's privilege does not protect the public employee's identity. *Cf. United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660, 665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform).

You state portions of the remaining information identify complainants who reported violations of law to the department. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the university has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information we have marked. Therefore, the university may withhold the

information we have marked within the basic information in Representative Sample C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we note the informer at issue in the information you have marked Representative Sample B was a public employee acting within the scope of her employment. Furthermore, you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information identifies an informer for purposes of the common-law informer's privilege; thus, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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. Representative Sample B pertains to a report of alleged sexual assault. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally, only information that 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. ORD 393 at 2; *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); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). Further, where the requestor knows the identity of the victim, the entire report must be withheld to protect the victim's privacy. In this instance, we note the sexual assault victim is identified only by a pseudonym, and the pseudonym sufficiently protects the identity of the sexual assault victim. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing to an identifiable individual and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the university must withhold Representative Sample A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. With the exception of the basic information, the university may withhold Representative Sample C under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing the basic information, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The university 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tim Neal', written in a cursive style.

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 595159

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)