



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 17, 2016

Mr. Guillermo Trevino
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-11331

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 611350 (Fort Worth PIR Nos. W050028, W050030).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received two requests for information pertaining to a specified police report involving the requestor's client and all records associated with a given address over a specified time period. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state, and we agree, some of the submitted information, which you have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it does not concern the specified report or address. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.²

¹Although you do not raise section 552.130 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to do so based on your markings in the submitted information.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your arguments to withhold this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

Exhibit C-2 pertains to a report of an 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. ORD 393 at 2; *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). Further, where the requestor knows the identity of the victim, the entire report must be withheld to protect the victim’s privacy. The requestor in this case knows the identity of the alleged victim. We believe in this instance, withholding only identifying information from the requestor would not preserve the victim’s common-law right to privacy. Therefore, we conclude the city must withhold Exhibit C-2 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 58.007 of the Family Code. The relevant language of section 58.007 reads:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). Juvenile law enforcement records relating to delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007. *See id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision”). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). You state Exhibit C-3 is subject to section 58.007(c). However, upon review, we find the information at issue does not identify a suspect or offender who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age. As such, section 58.007 is not applicable and the city may not withhold Exhibit C-3 under section 552.101 on this basis.

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: (1) 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 information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). You state, and provide documentation showing, Exhibit C-1 relates to a pending criminal investigation and prosecution with the city’s police department and the Tarrant County District Attorney’s Office. Based on these representations, we conclude the release of Exhibit C-1 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to Exhibit C-1.

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). 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 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, which must be

released, the city may withhold Exhibit C-1 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁴

In summary the city must withhold Exhibit C-2 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold Exhibit C-1 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.⁵

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 Keeney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JDK/akg

Ref: ID# 611350

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁵We 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.