



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 2, 2015

Ms. Lisa D. Mares  
Counsel for the City of McKinney  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2015-06361

Dear Ms. Mares:

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# 558698 (McKinney Reference No. 10-13012).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all police reports involving a specified address for a specified time period. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You state the city will redact motor vehicle record information subject to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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 id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion. *See* ORD 684. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. Gov't Code § 552.147(b)

Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 58.007 of the Family Code. Section 58.007 provides, in relevant part:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), a “child” is a person who was ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Section 58.007(c) is not applicable to information that relates to a juvenile as a complainant, victim, witness, or other involved party; it is only applicable to juveniles listed as suspects or offenders. *See id.* §§ 51.03 (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of section 58.007), 58.007. Although the city asserts the information in Exhibit B-1 is confidential under section 58.007, the information at issue does not identify a juvenile suspect or offender for purposes of that section. Accordingly, the information in Exhibit B-1 is not confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(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.

*Id.* § 261.201(a). Upon review, we agree the information in Exhibit B-2, and the additional information we have marked, were used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city's police department (the "department"). *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of this section 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). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. You state the city has not adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Accordingly, we conclude the information in Exhibit B-2, and the additional information we have marked, are confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). 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). The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978).

You seek to withhold the information in Exhibit B-3 under the common-law informer's privilege. Upon review, we conclude 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. However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information at issue identifies an informer; thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on that basis.

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual's criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov't Code* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Further, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455* (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We find, however, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

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 the information in Exhibit C relates to pending criminal cases. Based on your representation, we find the city has demonstrated the release of the information in Exhibit C 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 that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976).

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-87; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Therefore, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information in Exhibit B-2, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit B-3 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction the common-law informer's privilege. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(1) 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](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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CRG/cbz

Ref: ID# 558698

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)