



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 11, 2015

Mr. James McKechnie
Assistant City Attorney
City of Wichita Falls
P.O. Box 1431
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307-1431

OR2015-09081

Dear Mr. McKechnie:

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# 563077 (City ID# 106).

The City of Wichita Falls (the "city") received a request for all information pertaining to a named individual during a specified period of time. The city claims the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."¹ 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. 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

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).

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 that a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the individual at issue. We find this request for unspecified law enforcement records implicates the named individual's right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.²

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/dls

Ref: ID# 563077

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the city's argument against disclosure.