KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 5, 2016

Mr. Brandon Dyson
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Angelo
72 West College Avenue
San Angelo, Texas 76903

OR2016-17695

Dear Mr. Dyson:

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# 621456.

The City of San Angelo (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to four specific addresses during specified periods of time.[1] You state the city will release most of the responsive information to the requestor. 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. This section 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

[1]We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

> 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find exhibits D-1 and D-2 were used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect; thus, this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *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). As the city does not indicate the city's police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, and based on our review, we determine the information at issue is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Therefore, the city must withhold exhibits D-1 and D-2 in their entireties 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 section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c). Section 58.007 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

> (c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:
>
> > (1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;
> >
> > (2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

> (3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), "child" means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age when the conduct occurred. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Upon review, we conclude exhibits F-1, F-2, F-3, and F-5 consist of law enforcement records involving juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision occurring after September 1, 1997, and is, therefore, subject to section 58.007(c). *See id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining "delinquent conduct" and "conduct indicating a need for supervision" for purposes of section 58.007). None of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply. Therefore, exhibits F-1, F-2, F-3, and F-5 are confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code and must be withheld in their entireties under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

However, the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information it has marked depicts an individual who is ten years of age or older and under the age of seventeen as a suspect or offender of delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision. *See id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining "delinquent conduct" and "conduct indicating a need for supervision" for purposes of section 58.007). Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code.

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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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.[2] *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,

---

[2]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).

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.

Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. The city seeks to withhold the entirety of exhibits E-1, E-2, and E-3 under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the information at issue must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information it has indicated is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information it has indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the remaining information contains information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code, which provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.[3] Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold exhibits D-1 and D-2 in their entireties under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold exhibits F-1, F-2, F-3, and F-5 in their entireties under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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.

---

[3]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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# 621456

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)