



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 5, 2014

Mr. Daniel C. Garza
Assistant City Attorney
City of Laredo
P.O. Box 579
Laredo, Texas 78042-0579

OR2014-03747

Dear Mr. Garza:

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# 515928.

The City of Laredo (the "city") received a request for all reports involving a named individual. 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.

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 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, we note you have submitted reports in which the a named individual is not listed as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. We will address your argument against disclosure of this information.

Next, we note you have redacted employee identification numbers from the information at issue. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). However, you do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the city is authorized to withhold any of the redacted information without first seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). As such, this type of information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. Because we are able to discern the nature of the redacted information, we will address its public availability. In the future, the city should refrain from redacting responsive information that it submits to this office in connection with a request for an open records ruling, unless the information is the subject of a previous determination under section 552.301 of the Government Code or may be withheld pursuant to statutory authority. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See id.* § 552.302.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*, 540 S.W.2d at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). However, we note the public has a legitimate interest in knowing the details of a crime. *See Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting a "legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity" (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994))). We find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue 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.¹ Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the license plate information we have marked in the information at issue under section 552.130 of the Government Code.²

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 license plate information we have marked under section 552.130. 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

¹The 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).

²Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. 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 Gov't Code § 552.130(d), (e).

Ref: ID# 515928

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)