



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 14, 2016

Ms. Akilah Mance
Counsel for the City of Morgan Point
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2016-05870

Dear Ms. Mance:

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# 607994 (ORR No. MPT 16-003).

The City of Morgan Point (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the city police department's policy regarding interference with child custody matters and the quantity of arrests and number of calls received regarding interference with child custody. You state the city will redact 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 section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have not submitted any information pertaining to the requested policy. Therefore, to the extent information responsive to this aspect of the request exists, we assume

¹Section 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 the social security number of a living person without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. *See 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 decision.

you have released it to the requestor. *See* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible). If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 261.201(a) 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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of Family Code chapter 261); *see also 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 disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). Accordingly, we find this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. You have not indicated the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information; therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude 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 *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (addressing predecessor statute). However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate how the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments for this information.

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. Thus, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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. 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.

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,



Britni Ramirez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BR/bhf

³Section 552.102(a) excepts 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).

Ref: ID# 607994

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)