



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 7, 2016

Ms. Stacie S. White
Counsel for the City of Saginaw
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2016-05290

Dear Ms. White:

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# 600908.

The City of Saginaw (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named individual and the requestor at a specified address for a specified period of time. You state the city will redact some information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim the submitted 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.

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.

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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 under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion.

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. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. The city contends the present request requires it to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual. However, we note the requestor seeks specified records. Thus, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual. Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy as a criminal history compilation.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 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.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of

age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k). Upon review, we find portions of the submitted information were used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect. *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). Thus, the submitted information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. In this case, although the requestor is the parent of the child victims named in the information at issue, the requestor is alleged to have committed the suspected abuse or neglect. Thus, the requestor does not have a right of access to the submitted information under section 261.201(k). *See id.* § 261.201(k). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.²

You next assert the remaining information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code, which provides the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [or]

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1)-(2). Generally, section 552.108(a)(1) is mutually exclusive of section 552.108(a)(2). Section 552.108(a)(1) protects information that pertains to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. In contrast, section 552.108(a)(2) protects information that relates to a concluded criminal investigation or prosecution that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551

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

S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. You state “[t]he responsive materials include information relating to incidents for which investigations and/or prosecution is currently pending.” You also state “[t]he responsive materials contain information held by the [city] which relates to the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime which resulted in an outcome other than conviction or deferred adjudication.” However, you have submitted multiple incident reports, and you have not identified which reports are related to pending criminal investigations or prosecutions and which reports are related to concluded cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Further, we find you have failed to demonstrate the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108 to any portion of the remaining information. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.³ *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens’ dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. We note the requestor has a right of access to his own date of birth under section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from her under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person’s agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, with the exception of the requestor’s date of birth, the city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

³Section 552.102(a) exempts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a).

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(a) of the Family Code. With the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.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,



Katelyn Blackburn-Rader
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB-R/bw

Ref: ID# 600908

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴ We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a ruling from this office.