



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 19, 2013

Mr. Robert G. Schleier, Jr.
For City of Kilgore
Law Office of Robert G. Schleier, Jr.
116 North Kilgore Street
Kilgore, Texas 75662

OR2013-02724

Dear Mr. Schleier:

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# 479138.

The Kilgore Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information regarding the requestor's application for a position with the department, including information obtained during the requestor's background investigation. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted 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 must address the department's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The department received the request for information on November 19, 2012. You state the department observed holidays on November 22 and November 23, 2012. We note this office does not count the date the request was received or holidays as business days for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, the department's ten-business-day deadline was December 5, 2012. Our office received the department's

request for a ruling on December 10, 2012. The envelope containing the department's request for a ruling does not bear a postmark date or meter mark date, and we are otherwise unable to determine whether the department mailed this information on or before December 5, 2012. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* ORD 630. Because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure, we will address the department's arguments under that section.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 common-law right of 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered intimate or 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.

Generally, only information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, a governmental body is required to withhold an entire report when identifying information is inextricably intertwined with other releasable information or when the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. *See* ORDs 393, 339; *see also* *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victim of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have legitimate interest in such information); ORD 440 (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). In this instance, a portion of the submitted information pertains to an alleged

sex-related offense. Additionally, the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. Thus, withholding only the victim's identifying information from this requestor would not preserve the victim's common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, to protect the victim's privacy, the department must withhold the information we have marked in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information ("CHRI") generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. Upon review, we find a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the department must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code the information we have marked under common-law privacy and the information we have marked under section 411.083 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.¹

¹We note the information being released contains the requestor's driver's license number to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.130(a)(1) without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). Therefore, if the department receives another request for the same information from a person who would not have a right of access to this information, section 552.130(c) authorizes the department to redact this requestor's driver's license information without requesting another ruling.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kristi L. Wilkins
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLW/ag

Ref: ID# 479138

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)