



October 25, 2002

Ms. Stephanie Gonzalez
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lewisville
P.O. Box 299002
Lewisville, Texas 75029-9002

OR2002-6056

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 171225.

The City of Lewisville (the "city") received a request for the complete investigations and all affidavits in relation to two tickets issued to a named individual, and the final judgment or sentencing of the individual in relation to the tickets. You advise that there is no information responsive to the request for judgment and sentencing because the relevant citations were quashed before adjudication¹, and that you have provided the requestor with the Order on Motion to Quash. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. The law firm on behalf of which the request was made has submitted arguments regarding why some or all of the information should be released. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting member of public to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released). We have considered the arguments of the parties and have reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹ The Public Information Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

² We assume that the "sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.108 provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(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

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). 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 information at issue relates to two quashed citations, one of which was not refiled, and the other of which was refiled but dismissed with prejudice. Thus, you state that the citations did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representations, we find that section 552.108 is applicable to the records relating to the relevant criminal investigations.

However, section 552.108 is inapplicable to basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). We believe such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Company 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). Information normally found on the front page of an offense report is generally considered public. See generally Gov't Code § 552.108(c); *Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d 177; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). Thus, the city may not withhold basic front page offense information relating to the criminal investigations under section 552.108, but may withhold from disclosure the remaining records related to the investigations based on section 552.108(a)(2).

We note that the identification of the complainants in the submitted information is basic information. Open Records Decision 127 at 4. You claim that the complainants' identifying information should not be released pursuant to the informer's privilege under section 552.101.³ See *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App 1969); Open Records Decision Nos. 582 (1990), 515 (1988). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). However, the informer's privilege does not categorically

³ Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information deemed confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses the common-law informer's privilege.

protect from release the identification and description of a complainant. The identity of a complainant, whether an "informant" or not, may only be withheld upon a showing that special circumstances exist.

We have addressed several special situations in which front page offense report information may be withheld from disclosure. For example, in Open Records Decision No. 366 (1983), this office agreed that the statutory predecessor to section 552.108 protected from disclosure information about an ongoing undercover narcotics operation, even though some of the information at issue was front page information contained in an arrest report. The police department explained how release of certain details would interfere with the undercover operation, which was ongoing and was expected to culminate in more arrests. Open Records Decision No. 366 (1983); *see* Open Records Decision No. 333 at 2 (1982); *cf.* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983) (identifying information concerning victims of sexual assault), 339 (1982), 169 at 6-7 (1977), 123 (1976).

Based upon the information provided to this office, you have not shown special circumstances sufficient to overcome the presumption of public access to the complainants' identities. Consequently, we conclude that the city must release this information as it constitutes relevant front page information. We note, however, that a complainant's telephone number and address are generally not front page offense report information and need not be released.

You also claim that some information contained within the basic information is protected under section 552.101 and common-law privacy. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses the common-law right to privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), and personal financial information pertaining to voluntary financial decisions and financial transactions that do not involve public funds, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). Upon review of the information at issue, however, we find that none of it is private. Therefore, you may not withhold any additional information under section 552.101 and common-law privacy.

In summary, you may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108, with the exception of basic information, which must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this

ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kristen Bates".

Kristen Bates
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/seg

Ref: ID# 171225

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Randy Kildow
Randy Kildow Investigations
1211 South Bowen, Suite 206
Arlington, Texas 76013
(w/o enclosures)