



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 28, 2008

Ms. Maria Angela Flores Beck
City Attorney
City of La Grange
155 East Colorado
La Grange, Texas 78945

OR2008-04103

Dear Ms. Beck:

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# 305998.

The La Grange Police Department (the "department") received a request for all information pertaining to three named individuals.¹ You state that the department will release a portion of the requested information. You claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception 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."² Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (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

¹You state that the requestor subsequently narrowed her request to exclude Texas driver's license numbers, social security numbers, and any phone number that was collected as the result of a 9-1-1 call. Accordingly, this information is not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information and the department need not release it in response to the request.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States 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. The present request requires the department to compile unspecified police records concerning the three individuals at issue. Therefore, to the extent the department maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the department must withhold such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.³ However, information relating to routine traffic violations is not excepted from release under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *Cf. Gov't Code § 411.082(2)(B)* (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). The department has submitted information related to routine traffic violations. The department may not withhold any submitted information relating to routine traffic violations on this basis. As you raise no further exceptions for this information, it 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id. § 552.324(b)*. In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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

³As our ruling is dispositive for the information you claim is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we need not address that argument.


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 challenge 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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/eeg

Ref: ID# 305998

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Natali Serene Ray
Paralegal
BrownSims P.C.
1177 West Loop South, 10th Floor
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)