



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 15, 2008

Ms. Cheryl K. Byles  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2008-06627

Dear Ms. Byles:

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# 310196.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all call sheets and reports pertaining to a specified address during a particular time period. 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.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Gov't Code § 552.101. You

---

<sup>1</sup>You state that you have redacted certain Texas motor vehicle record information pursuant to the previous determinations issued to the city in Open Records Letter Nos. 2006-14726 (2006) and 2007-00198 (2007). See Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001). In addition, you state that the city has redacted social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b) (governmental body may redact social security number without necessity of requesting decision from this office under the Act).

contend that portions of the submitted information are made confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides in pertinent part:

(a) The following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You claim that portions of the submitted information are confidential under section 261.201. Upon review, we agree some of the information, which we have marked, was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect of a child. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201 as “person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes”). You have not indicated that the city’s police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information; therefore, we assume that no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.<sup>2</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). As to the remaining information you seek to withhold under section 261.201, we find that you have failed to demonstrate how the information at issue relates to an investigation conducted under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Consequently, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy 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). The type 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,

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information.

psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683.

Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated that the requestor knows the identity of the individual at issue and the nature of the incident, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. In this instance, although you seek to withhold the remaining information in its entirety, you have not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, that this is a situation where all of the information must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. In addition, we find that none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communications districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218 and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code are applicable to emergency 9-1-1 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These sections make the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a 9-1-1 service provider confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.118 applies to an emergency communications district for a county with a population of more than two million. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communications district for a county with a population of more than 860,000. Section 772.318 applies to an emergency communications district for a county with a population of more than 20,000.

You state that the city is part of an emergency communications district established under section 772.218. You claim that the telephone numbers and address you have marked in the remaining information were furnished by a 9-1-1 service provider. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that the city must withhold the marked telephone numbers and address under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the telephone numbers and address you have marked in the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code. The remaining submitted information 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 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# 310196

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Brian L. Wilsford  
4874 Hope Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76114  
(w/o enclosures)