



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 22, 2016

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

OR2016-18932

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# 623474 (City File No. 16-470).

The San Angelo Police Department (the "department") received a request for three specified police reports. You state you have released some information. 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 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 information made confidential by other statutes, including section 261.201 of the Family Code. Section 261.201 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 Youth Commission, 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

(3) the identity of the person who made the report.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2)-(3). Upon review, we find the submitted information consists of reports used or developed in the department's investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse. *See id.* §§ 261.001(1) (definition of "abuse" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code), 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). Accordingly, we determine the submitted information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. However, you state the requestor is the parent of the child victim listed in the reports and is not alleged to have committed the alleged or suspected abuse. Therefore, the submitted information may not be withheld from this requestor on the basis of section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(l)(2) states any

information excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(1)(2).

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 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 must explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You inform us the information submitted as Exhibit B relates to a pending investigation. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude release of Exhibit B would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of a 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 per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code is applicable to Exhibit B.

We note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the department may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

You claim section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy for the basic information in Exhibit B and all of Exhibit D. 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 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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we agree the reports at issue contain information that is considered highly intimate or embarrassing and is not of legitimate concern to the public. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual’s privacy. In this instance, the requestor is the father of

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the requestor has a special right of access to the information being released pursuant to section 261.201(k) of the Family Code. Accordingly, if the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the department should again seek a decision from this office.

the child whose privacy interest is implicated. Under section 552.023 of the Government Code, “a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests.” 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 representative). Thus, because the requestor is the parent of the child at issue, the remaining information may not be withheld in its entirety from the requestor on the basis of section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

However, 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. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 682 (Tex. 1976). 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>2</sup> *Tex. 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 department must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 261.201(1)(3) of the Family Code states the identity of the reporting party must be withheld. *See* Fam. Code § 261.201(1)(3). Thus, the department must withhold the identity of the reporting party, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(1)(3) of the Family Code.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, the department may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the identity of the reporting party, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(1)(3) of the Family Code. The remaining information must be released.

---

<sup>2</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).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Erin Groff". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erin Groff  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EMB/eb

Ref: ID# 623474

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)