



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 25, 2006

Mr. Miles K. Risley
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Victoria
P.O. Box 1758
Victoria, Texas 77902-1758

OR2006-11123

Dear Mr. Risley:

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# 260246.

The City of Victoria (the "city") received a request for information related to a specified incident that occurred on October 8, 2003, information related to any of five named individuals at a specified address from September 1, 2002 until the present, and information related to four named individuals from June 1, 2001 until the present. You claim that the requested 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.

Initially, we note that you have not submitted any information responsive to the request for information related to the incident of October 8, 2003. Therefore, we assume that, to the extent this information existed when the city received the request, it has been released to the requestor. If not, you must release it immediately. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (section 552.221(a) requires that information not excepted from disclosure must be released as soon as possible under the circumstances).

Section 552.101 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 if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find that a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not private and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

In this instance, the request seeks unspecified law enforcement records regarding named individuals. Thus, this request implicates these individuals' rights to privacy. However, section 552.023 of the Government Code gives a person or a person's authorized representative a special right of access to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests. *See Gov't Code § 552.023*. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 on the basis of the requestor's common-law privacy interests. However, the city must withhold any criminal records where the other named individuals are listed as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, to the extent they exist, under common law privacy as encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by other statutes. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997 are confidential under section 58.007 of the Family Code. Section 58.007(c) provides:

(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 Subchapter B.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). The information we have marked relates to allegations of juvenile conduct that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.02(2) (providing that in title 3 of Family Code, “child” means person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age). Thus, this information is subject to section 58.007, and it does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting any of the named individuals other than the requestor as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, it must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code.¹

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

¹As our ruling under section 58.007 is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument.

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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/dh

Ref: ID# 260246

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Belinda Seaman
116 West Haven
Victoria, Texas 77904
(w/o enclosures)