



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 29, 2016

Ms. Stacie S. White  
Counsel for the City of Saginaw  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2016-06970

Dear Ms. White:

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# 603325.

The City of Saginaw (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for specified incident reports and information pertaining to specified incidents. You state the city will redact some information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147 of the Government Code and Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. 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 the doctrine of common-law privacy, which

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion.

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. 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 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 a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. The city contends the present request requires it to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning an individual. However, we note the requestor seeks specified records. Thus, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning an individual. Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy as a criminal history compilation.

Next, we note submitted report number 150001137 may have been the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-05290 (2016). In that ruling, we determined, in part, the city failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108 of the Government Code, and determined the city must: (1) withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, with the exception of the requestor's date of birth, and (2) release the remaining information. The city again raises section 552.108 of the Government Code for report number 150001137. Section 552.007 of the Government Code provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See Gov't Code § 552.007*; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.007, the city may not now withhold any previously released information unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. Although the city raises section 552.108, it is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 586 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.108). As such, this section does not prohibit the release of information or make information confidential. Thus, to the extent the city previously released report number 150001137 in response to the earlier request, the city may not withhold report number 150001137 under section 552.108. We also note the present

requestor does not have the same right of access as the previous requestor. Thus, with respect to the information previously released from report number 150001137 in accordance with the previous requestor's right of access, we find circumstances have changed. However, section 552.101 makes information confidential under the Act. Accordingly, in the event report number 15001137 was previously released in response to the earlier ruling, we will consider the applicability of section 552.101 to report number 150001137. In the event report number 15001137 was not previously released in response to the earlier ruling, we will address your argument under section 552.108 for report number 15001137, along with your arguments for the remaining submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he 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.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law[.]

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we find a portion of the submitted information consists of a report of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect made to the city. *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), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find the information at issue is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. We note, however, the requestor is a parent of the child victims listed in the information and is not alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect. Thus, pursuant to section 261.201(k), the information at issue may not be withheld from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(l)(2) states any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Accordingly, we will consider your argument under section 552.108 of the Government Code for the information at issue. Furthermore, we note the remaining information pertains to violations of a protective order involving two adults. Thus, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information involves a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect of a child made under chapter 261 or the information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

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, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 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 the submitted information pertains to a pending prosecution. Based on your representation, we conclude the release of the submitted information 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 the submitted information.

However, we note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 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). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

In the event report number 15001137 was previously released in response to the earlier ruling, we note it contains a date of birth. As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. 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. *Id.* 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>3</sup> *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. Thus, the city must withhold the date of birth in report number 15001137 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent report number 150001137 was previously released in response to Open Records Letter No. 2016-05290, then the city must withhold the date of birth in report number 150001137 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and release the remainder of report number 150001137. To the extent report number 150001137 was not previously released in response to Open Records Letter No. 2016-05290, the with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold report number 15001137 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In either event,

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

<sup>3</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).

with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>4</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,



Meagan J. Conway  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MJC/akg

Ref: ID# 603325

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a ruling from this office.