



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 16, 2016

Ms. Aimee Alcorn  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Corpus Christi  
P.O. Box 9277  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2016-06116

Dear Ms. Alcorn:

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# 601769 (CRod3 and CRod4).

The Corpus Christi Police Department (the "department") received two requests from the same requestor for a specified incident and records pertaining to a named individual, the requestor, and the requestor's minor children for a specified time period. You indicate you have released some information. 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.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses 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.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law; and

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we find the submitted information was used or developed in investigations by the department of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 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). Accordingly, we find the information at issue is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. However, as you acknowledge, the requestor is a parent of some of the child victims in both investigations, and is not alleged to have committed the abuse. The requestor is also one of the child victims listed in a portion of the information, and the requestor is now an adult. Therefore, the department may not withhold the submitted information from the requestor under section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(l)(2) states that any information excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law may still be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Accordingly, we will consider whether the submitted information is otherwise excepted under the Act.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information about an individual if it (1) contains

highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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).

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. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d 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.<sup>1</sup> *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.

Additionally, 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).

We note the requestor is one of the individuals whose privacy interests are at issue and is also a parent of some of the minor children whose privacy interests are at issue; thus, she has a right of access to her own private information, as well as that of her minor children, pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself or person for whom she is authorized

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 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).

representative). However, the requestor does not have a special right of access to information that implicates the other individuals' privacy interests. Further, we note the requestor knows the identity of the other alleged victim in one of the reports. We believe, in this instance, withholding only identifying information of the other victim from the requestor would not preserve the common-law right to privacy of the other victim. Thus, the requestor's right of access to information under section 552.023 does not overcome another individual's privacy right in the same information. Therefore, to protect the privacy of the other victim, the department must withhold case number 1506190170 in its entirety pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Additionally, upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must also withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold case number 1506190170 in its entirety and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.<sup>2</sup>

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](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,



Matthew Taylor  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MT/dls

---

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to the information being released in this instance. See Fam. Code § 261.201(k); see also Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the department should again seek a ruling from this office.

Ref: ID# 601769

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)