



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 26, 2016

Mr. Jaime Tijerina
Deputy City Attorney
City of Mission
1201 East 8th Street
Mission, Texas 78572

OR2016-09352

Dear Mr. Tijerina:

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# 613871.

The City of Mission (the "city") received a request for all 9-1-1 calls to a specified address, all reports by a named individual, and all reports against the requestor. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.10 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. 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82.

Report number 2015-00025004 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). The requestor in this case knows the identity of the alleged victim. We believe in this instance, withholding only identifying information from the requestor would not preserve the victim's common-law right to privacy. Therefore, we conclude the city must withhold report number 2015-00025004 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [T]he 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.

...

(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

¹As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

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.

(1) 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[.]

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (1)(2). Report numbers 2016-00006519 and 2016-00000612 consist of reports of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect made to the city. *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 this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. We note the requestor is a parent of the child victims listed in the information. However, we note the requestor is alleged to have committed the suspected abuse or neglect in report number 2016-00006519. Thus, the requestor does not have a right of access to report number 2016-00006519 under section 261.201(k). *See id.* § 261.201(k). Therefore, we conclude report number 2016-00006519 is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

The requestor is not alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect in report number 2016-00000612. Thus, pursuant to section 261.201(k), report number 2016-00000612 may not be withheld from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(1)(2) states any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(1)(2). Accordingly, we will consider your arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code for report number 2016-00000612, as well as the remaining information.

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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state report numbers 2016-00000612 and 2016-00005712 relate to pending criminal investigations or prosecutions. Based upon your representation, we conclude release of the information you have marked within these reports will 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). Accordingly, we find the city may withhold the information you marked within report numbers 2016-00000612 and 2016-00005712 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. Thus, the city must withhold the public citizens’ dates of birth you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold report number 2015-00025004 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold report number 2016-00006519 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city may withhold the information you marked within report numbers 2016-00000612 and 2016-00005712 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizens’ dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction

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).

with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information to this requestor.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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 613871

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴We note the requestor has a right of access to the information being released in this instance. If the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).