



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 3, 2006

Ms. Rashaad V. Gambrell
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2006-01163

Dear Ms. Gambrell:

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# 241633.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for any and all information related to a specific police report involving the death of the requestor's son. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(2) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . 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). Section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable only if the information in question relates to a concluded case that did not result in a conviction or a deferred adjudication. You inform us that the submitted information in Exhibits 2 and 3 pertains to a criminal investigation that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to this information.

However, section 552.108 does not except basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. See Gov't Code § 552.108(c); *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). We believe such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*, including a detailed description of the offense. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-87. Thus, the city must release the types of information that are considered to be front page information, even if this information is not actually located on the front page. See Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information made public by *Houston Chronicle*).

The city contends that a portion of the basic information is subject to section 552.101 and the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). However, because “the right of privacy is purely personal,” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded.” *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, *writ ref'd n.r.e.*); see also *Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 146-47 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded”) (quoting Restatement of Torts 2d); See Attorney General Opinion JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Here, the person at issue is deceased; therefore, this person’s information is not protected under common-law privacy. Therefore, with the exception of basic information that must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code. As this ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Michael A. Lehmann
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAL/sdk

Ref: ID# 241633

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Shirley Nagel
4174 Meyerwood
Houston, Texas 77025
(w/o enclosures)