



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 2, 2015

Ms. Captoria Brown
Paralegal
Office of the City Attorney
City of Carrollton
1945 East Jackson Road
Carrollton, Texas 75006

OR2015-22932

Dear Ms. Brown:

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# 585604 (City ID# 5616).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for a specified police report. 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 disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses other statutes that make information confidential, such as section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

(a) Except as provided by Section 261.203, the 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 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). You assert the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged child abuse or neglect. *See* Act of June 1, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 1273, § 4, 2015 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 4310, 4312 (to be codified as an amendment to Fam. Code § 261.001(1)) (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of 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). Upon review, we find the submitted information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. As you do not indicate the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such rule exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must generally withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (addressing predecessor statute).

However, section 261.201 provides information encompassed by subsection (a) may be disclosed “for purposes consistent with [the Family Code] and applicable federal or state law.” Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Subchapter E of chapter 264 of the Family Code concerns the establishment and duties of children’s advocacy centers. *See id.* §§ 264.401-411. Section 264.405 of the Family Code directs children’s advocacy centers to provide services for victims of child abuse and their families. *Id.* § 264.405. Furthermore, section 264.408(c) of the Family Code provides “a law enforcement agency . . . may share with a [children’s advocacy] center information that is confidential under Section 261.201 as needed to provide services” under chapter 264 of the Family Code. *Id.* § 264.408(c).

In this instance, the requestor indicates she is a representative of Dallas Court Appointed Special Advocates (“CASA”). However, the requestor does not state whether she seeks the requested report in order to provide services under chapter 264 of the Family Code. Therefore, we must rule conditionally. If the city determines the information is needed to provide services under chapter 264 of the Family Code, then the city may release the information to this requestor pursuant to section 264.408(c).¹ We note information shared with or provided to CASA under section 264.408(c) retains its confidentiality under section 261.201. *See id.* If, however, the city does not determine the information is needed

¹ Although you also argue the submitted information is protected by the right to privacy, the requestor’s statutory right of access prevails over the doctrine of common-law privacy. *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 statute directly conflicts with common-law principle); *CenterPoint Energy Houston Elec. LLC v. Harris County Toll Rd.*, 436 F.3d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 2006) (common law controls only where there is no conflicting or controlling statutory law).

for services under chapter 264, then it may not release the information on that ground, and the city must withhold the information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.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,



Joseph Behnke
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 585604

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²In that event, our ruling is dispositive and we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.