



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 12, 2014

Ms. Rachel L. Lindsay
Counsel for City of McKinney
Brown & Hoffmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2014-02679

Dear Ms. Lindsay:

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# 514034.

The City of McKinney (the "the city"), which you represent, received a request for any and all records relating to a named individual.¹ You state the city released most of the requested information. You claim 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 from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section 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

¹We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

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.

The present request seeks unspecified reports pertaining to a named individual. This request requires the city to compile the named individual's criminal history and implicates the privacy of the named individual. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing the named individual 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. However, you have submitted records that do not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not implicate the privacy interest of the named individual and may not be withheld as a compilation of the individual's criminal history under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses 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 [the Act], 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). We note some of the requested information was used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect by the city's police department. Upon review, we find this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code), 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). As you do not indicate the city's police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, and based on

our review, we determine this information, which we have marked, is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Therefore, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.² However, we find none of the remaining information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

As noted above, common-law privacy 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). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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 involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the information must be withheld in its entirety to protect the individual's privacy. Although you argue reports 12-004930 and 2013-066508 are confidential in their entireties pursuant to common-law privacy, we find this is not a situation where all of this information must be withheld to protect any individual's privacy interest. However, we find portions of report 2013-066508 satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked in report 2013-066508 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate and embarrassing or not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release.³ Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle information we have marked in under section 552.130 of the Government Code.⁴

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

³The 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).

⁴Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsections 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing the named individual 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. 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 information we have marked in report 2013-066508 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



Megan G. Holloway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MGH/akg

Ref: ID# 514034

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)