



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 7, 2015

Ms. Julie P. Doshier
Counsel for the City of Lancaster
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Ross Tower
500 North Akard Street
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2015-20963

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 582711 (Ref. No. 72751).

The City of Lancaster (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to three specified addresses. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.¹ 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 Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code, which makes confidential juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct by a child that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. Fam. Code § 58.007(c). The relevant portion of section 58.007 provides:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise,

¹Although you cite to section 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code in your briefing to this office, we understand you to raise section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code based on the substance of your arguments.

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.

Id. § 58.007(c). *See also id.* § 51.02(2) (defining “child” as a person who is ten years of age or older and younger than seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct). Upon review, we find the reports we have marked involve delinquent conduct by a child that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See* Act of June 1, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 935, § 18, 2015 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 3224, 3233-34 (to be codified as amendments to Fam. Code § 51.03) (defining “delinquent conduct” for purposes of section 58.007). Further, it does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply. Therefore, the reports we marked are confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code and the city must withhold these reports under section 552.101 of the Government Code.²

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the information you marked relates to a criminal investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to this information.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note the unmarked portion of the report

²In this instance, as our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

at issue does not contain information sufficient to satisfy the requirement that a “detailed description of the offense” be released as basic information. *See* ORD 127. Accordingly, we determine the city must release a sufficient portion of the narrative to encompass a detailed description of the offense to satisfy the required release of basic information pursuant to *Houston Chronicle*. Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated that the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the submitted information must be withheld in its entirety to protect the individual’s privacy. Additionally, under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 682. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.³ *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens’ dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3.

In this instance, although you claim the remaining information is protected in its entirety by common-law privacy, you have not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which this information must be withheld in its entirety on that basis. Upon review, however, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the dates of birth you have marked and the information we have marked under

³Section 552.102(a) exempts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a).

section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city has failed to demonstrate, however, how any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the reports we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the dates of birth you have marked and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/bhf

Ref: ID# 582711

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)