



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 13, 2016

Mr. John A. Haislet
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of College Station
P.O. Box 9960
College Station, Texas 77842

OR2016-08274

Dear Mr. Haislet:

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# 605780 (City File No. A16-000135).

The City of College Station (the "city") received a request for a specified police report and all documents related to the investigation. 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.

Initially, we note you have redacted information from the submitted documents. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, you have been granted a previous determination to withhold such information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). In this instance, we are able to discern the nature of the information that has been redacted; thus, being deprived of that information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. Nevertheless, be advised 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 be released. *See* Gov't Code

§ 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of “specific information requested”); *id.* § 552.302. Thus, in the future, the city should refrain from redacting, without authorization, any information it submits to this office in seeking an open records ruling.

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 concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. You state the submitted information pertains to a concluded criminal investigation that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the submitted 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 also* 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. ORD 127 at 3-4. Accordingly, with the exception of this basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

You assert the basic information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which 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 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. The submitted information pertains to a report of alleged sexual assault. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally, only information that 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) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such

information); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). In this instance, you seek to withhold the entirety of the basic information 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 identity of the victim. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the entirety of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Further, the victim in the information at issue is identified by a pseudonym. We find the use of a pseudonym sufficiently protects this victim's identity. Moreover, we find none of the remaining basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the basic information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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,



Ian Lancaster
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

IML/akg

Ref: ID# 605780

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)