



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 1, 2014

Mr. Danny Krumnow  
Chief of Police  
Riesel Police Department  
P.O. Box 249  
Riesel, Texas 76682

OR2014-21573

Dear Mr. Krumnow:

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# 544966.

The Riesel Police Department (the “department”) received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the department does not have some of the requested information.<sup>1</sup> We understand you have released the CR-3 accident report form to the requestors. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(c)(4) (officer’s accident report must be released to person who provides two of following three pieces of information: date of accident; name of any person involved in accident; specific location of accident). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism’d); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). Likewise, a governmental body is not required to create or obtain information that is not in its possession, so long as no other individual or entity holds that information on behalf of the governmental body that receives the request. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.002(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 534 at 2-3 (1989), 518 at 3 (1989).

and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, we note the information we have marked is not responsive to one or both of the instant requests for information because it was created after the department received the requests. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the department need not release non-responsive information in response to the requests.

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 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 [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). Upon review, we find the responsive information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect; thus, this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 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), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). As you do not indicate the 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 the responsive information is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).* Therefore, the department must withhold the

---

<sup>2</sup>We assume the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988).* This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

responsive information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.<sup>3</sup>

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](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,



Lee Seidlits  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 544966

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.