

January 29, 1999



OFFICE OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF TEXAS

— * —

JOHN CORNYN
Attorney General

— * —

P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas
78711-2548
(512) 463-2100
www.oag.state.tx.us

Mr. Charles M. Allen, II
Legal Office
Richardson Police Department
P.O. Box 831078
Richardson, Texas 75088-1078

OR99-0283

Dear Mr. McAllen:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 121588.

The Richardson Police Department received a request for any complaints received on or about September 6-7, 1992 regarding allegations of ritual abuse made by a named individual. You claim that the responsive information, submitted as Exhibit C, is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the documents at issue.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation;

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

* * *

(c) This section does not except from the requirements of Section 552.021 information that is basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.

Gov't Code § 552.108. Generally, a governmental body claiming an exception under section 552.108 must reasonably explain, if the information does not supply the explanation on its face, how and why section 552.108 is applicable. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108, .301(b)(1); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. You state that "the investigation [here] did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication." It appears from the records that such is the case. You have shown the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2). Thus, we conclude that most of the requested information may be withheld.

We note, however, that information normally found on the front page of an offense report is generally considered public. *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). Thus, you must release the type of information that is considered to be front page offense report information, even if this information is not actually located on the front page of the offense report. Gov't Code § 552.108(c); *see* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing the types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*).

Some of the front page offense report information in this case, however, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101. In sexual assault cases, section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure certain information that is not normally excepted under section 552.108. Section 552.101 excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Under section 552.101, information may be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects information if it is highly intimate or embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and the

public has no legitimate interest in it. *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982), we concluded that a sexual assault victim has a common-law privacy interest which prevents disclosure of information that would identify them. *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 legitimate interest in such information). You must withhold any information that would identify the victims of the alleged sexual assault in this case

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,



Don Ballard
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JDB\nc

Ref: ID# 121588

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Ms. Cynthia A. Curry
Cowles & Thompson
901 Main Street, Suite 4000
Dallas, Texas 75202-3793
(w/o enclosures)