



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 11, 2013

Mr. William P. Chesser
City Attorney
City of Brownwood
P.O. Box 1389
Brownwood, Texas 76804

OR2013-17781

Dear Mr. Chesser:

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# 501996.

The City of Brownwood (the "city") received a request for all police reports and call reports concerning six named individuals from another named individual during a specified time period. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "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 that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) 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) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in

courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Upon review, we find the present request, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individuals. Accordingly, we find the request implicates the named individuals' rights to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting any of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.¹ We note, however, you have submitted reports which do not list the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants. This information does not implicate the privacy interests of the named individuals. Thus, this information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy as a criminal history compilation. Accordingly, we will address your arguments for the information at issue.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides in relevant part:

(a) [T]he 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.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Youth Commission, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for this information.

representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(1) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law[.]

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (1)(2). Upon review, we find case number 11-001276 was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse. *See id.* § 261.001(1)(E) (definition of “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code includes sexual assault under Penal Code section 22.011); *see also* Penal Code § 22.011(c)(1) (defining “child” as “a person younger than 17 years of age”). Thus, the information at issue is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. We note, however, the requestor is the parent of the child victim named in the information at issue and is not alleged to have committed the suspected abuse. Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld from the requestor under section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(1)(2) states any information excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 261.201(1)(2). Accordingly, we will address your remaining arguments for the information at issue.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state case number 11-001276 relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to case number 11-001276.

Section 552.108, however, does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered

to be basic information). We note basic information does not include the identity of a witness. See ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold case number 11-001276 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

We understand you assert the basic information may be subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law and constitutional privacy. As noted above, common-law privacy protects highly intimate or embarrassing information that is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, no portion of the basic information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the basic information, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the basic information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the basic information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Additionally, you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege for the remaining report. Section 552.101 encompasses the informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. See *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988).

You assert the remaining report reveals the identity of a complainant who reported a possible violation of section 30.04 of the Penal Code. A violation of section 30.04 of the Penal Code is punishable by confinement. There is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information we have marked identifies the complainant; thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting any of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold case number 11-001276 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The city must release the remaining information.²

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/akg

²Because the requestor has a special right of access to the information being released pursuant to section 261.201(k) of the Family Code, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a decision from this office. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

Ref: ID# 501996

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)