



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 11, 2016

Ms. Vanessa Gonzalez  
Counsel for Southern Methodist University  
Bickerstaff Heath Delgado Acosta, L.L.P.  
Building One, Suite 300  
3711 South Mopac Expressway  
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2016-00780

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

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# 593982.

The Southern Methodist University Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for seventy-seven reports from 2012-2014.<sup>1</sup> You state the department does not maintain some of the requested information.<sup>2</sup> You also state the department will release some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the department sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

We note the department states it has redacted motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 of the Government Code and social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> The department also informs us it has redacted student-identifying information in the submitted responsive information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>5</sup> However, FERPA is not applicable to law enforcement records that are maintained and created by the department for a law enforcement purpose. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(ii); 34 C.F.R. §§ 99.3, .8. The submitted information consists of records that were created by the department for the purpose of law enforcement. Thus, these records are not subject to FERPA, and the department may not withhold any portion of them on that basis. Because we are able to discern the nature of the remaining redacted information, including public citizens’ dates of birth, we are not prevented from determining whether that information falls within the scope of the department’s exceptions to disclosure. Accordingly, we will address the department’s arguments with respect to the information at issue, including the remaining redacted information. Nevertheless, we caution the department that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering the redacted information to be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of specific information requested or representative sample if information is voluminous).

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,

---

<sup>3</sup>We assume the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

<sup>4</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* 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). 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 under the Act. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

<sup>5</sup>The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the “DOE”) has informed this office that FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General’s website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) 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 report numbers 140581, 140955, and 141066 pertain to active criminal investigations or prosecutions. Based on your representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue 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). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to report numbers 140581, 140955, and 141066.

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 the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has 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 report numbers 120446 and 130136 pertain to closed cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to report numbers 120446 and 130136.

However, we note 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*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes the identity and description of the complainant, but does not include the identity of the victim, unless the victim is the complainant. *See* ORD 127. Thus, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold report numbers 140581, 140955, and 141066 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold report numbers 120446 and 130136 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>6</sup>

You seek to withhold some information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer’s privilege. 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 the common-law informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer’s privilege protects the identities

---

<sup>6</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note basic information may not be withheld from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 597 at 2-3 (1991).

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 Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The 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." *See* Open Records Decision No. 279 at 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 4-5. The privilege protects the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer's identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). Further, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. 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 assert some of the basic information for report number 130136 should be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we note, and the information itself reveals, the subjects of the complaint know the identity of the complainant. *See* ORDs 515 at 3, 208 at 1-2. Consequently, the department has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege in this instance. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the basic information for report number 130136 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege.

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. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded that, generally, only that information which either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983); *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identities of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment are highly intimate or embarrassing information and public does not have legitimate interest in such information); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld).

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.* 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.<sup>7</sup> *Tex. 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, you seek to withhold the entirety of report number 130933 and the basic information for report number 140955 under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have not demonstrated, and we are not able to determine, the requestor knows the identities of the victims. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the entirety of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. However, upon review, we find the identifying information of the victim of sexual assault, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Further, the department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the sheriff's office may withhold report numbers 140581, 140955, and 141066 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold report numbers 120446 and 130136 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked and all public citizens' dates of birth in the remaining information 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.

---

<sup>7</sup>Section 552.102(a) excepts 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).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Britni Ramirez". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Britni Ramirez  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BR/bhf

Ref: ID# 593982

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)