ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2014

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P. O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2014-06456

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 520199.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for a specified police report. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.[1] We have considered the exception 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

The submitted information pertains to a report of alleged sexual assault. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally, only information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was

[1]Although you also claim section 552.108, you make no argument under this exception. Thus, we do not address section 552.108. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983); *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). Further, in those instances where it is determined the requestor knows the identity of the victim, the entire report must be withheld to protect the victim's privacy. The requestor in this case knows the identity of the alleged victim. We believe in this instance, withholding only identifying information from the requestor would not preserve the victim's common-law right to privacy. We conclude, therefore, the city must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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,

Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/eb

Ref: ID# 520199

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)