



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 6, 2016

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2016-10402

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 608854 (Ref. No. W112767).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to fifty-six specified case numbers. 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 some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we have marked, and the city need not release it in response to this request.

Next, we note the city has redacted portions of the submitted information. We understand the city has redacted motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ However, you do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have

¹Section 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

been authorized to withhold the remaining redacted information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the city should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

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[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information pertains to open criminal cases. We note, however, some of the incidents at issue involve criminal mischief and noise ordinance violations. These offenses are misdemeanors with statute of limitations periods of two years. *See* Penal Code § 28.03 (criminal mischief); *see also* Crim. Proc. Code art. 12.02 (stating misdemeanors subject to two year limitations period). More than two years have elapsed since the events giving rise to the incidents at issue. You have not informed this office any criminal charges were filed within the limitations periods. Furthermore, you have not otherwise explained how release of this information, which we have marked for release, would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Therefore, the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) to this information. Consequently, the city may not withhold the information we have marked for release under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, based on your representations, we conclude release of the remaining responsive 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 remaining responsive information.

However, 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). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic “front-page” information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of

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).

information considered to be basic information). Further, in Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996), this office concluded information contained in a computer-aided dispatch (“CAD”) report is substantially the same as basic information and, thus, is not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.108. *See* ORD 649 at 3; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 394 at 3 (1983) (no qualitative difference between information contained in radio cards or radio logs and front-page offense report information expressly held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*). We note basic information does not include dates of birth or motor vehicle record information encompassed by section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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 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 also concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

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.

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

³Section 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).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate 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, with the exception of the information we have marked for release and basic information, the city may withhold the submitted responsive information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/bw

Ref: ID# 608854

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)