



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 5, 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

OR2015-11063

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# 566262 (McKinney ID No. 15-14738).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all documents provided to the city by 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 public 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. Section 261.201 of the Family Code 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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find the submitted information relates to an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See 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), 261.001(1) (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). We have no indication the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Thus, the city must generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.

We note, however, the information at issue contains the fingerprints of the requestor’s client. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” Gov’t Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). However, section 560.002 of the Government Code provides, “[a] governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual . . . may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless . . . the individual consents to the disclosure[.]” *Id.* § 560.002(1)(A). Thus, the requestor has a right of access to his client’s fingerprints under section 560.002 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning themselves or individuals they represent).

However, there is a conflict between the confidentiality mandated under section 261.201 of the Family Code and the right of access provided to this requestor under section 560.002 of the Government Code. Where general and specific statutes are in irreconcilable conflict, the specific provision typically prevails over the general provision unless the general provision was enacted later and there is clear evidence that the legislature intended the general provision to prevail. *See* Gov’t Code § 311.026(b); *City of Lake Dallas v. Lake Cities Mun. Util. Auth.*, 555 S.W.2d 163, 168 (Tex. Civ. App.—Fort Worth 1977, writ ref’d n.r.e.). In this instance, we find section 261.201 of the Family Code generally applies to information used or developed in an investigation of alleged child abuse or child neglect. Section 560.002, however, applies specifically to biometric identifier information. Accordingly, we find the right of access provided to this requestor under section 560.002 prevails over the general confidentiality of section 261.201 of the Family Code. Further, we note statutory access provisions generally prevail over the common law. *See Collins v. Tex*

*Mall, L.P.*, 297 S.W.3d 409, 415 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2009, no pet.) (statutory provision controls and preempts common law only when it directly conflicts with common-law principle); *see also Cash Am. Intern. Inc., v. Bennett*, 35 S.W.3d 12, 16 (Tex. 2000) (statute depriving person of common-law right will not be extended beyond its plain meaning or applied to cases not clearly within its purview). Thus, with the exception of the fingerprints we have marked, which must be released to this requestor pursuant to section 560.002 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.<sup>1</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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NAY/cbz

Ref: ID# 566262

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your argument against disclosure. We note the requestor has a special right of access to the information being released. Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, it must again seek a ruling from this office.