



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 25, 2016

Mr. Omar De La Rosa  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of El Paso  
P.O. Box 1890  
El Paso, Texas 799550-1890

OR2016-11953

Dear Mr. De La Rosa:

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# 611678 (City Case# 16-1026-7243).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for twenty-nine categories of information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city redacted information pursuant to the previous determination issued to the city in Open Records Letter No. 2016-10113 (2016).<sup>1</sup> You state the city has released some information. 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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201 of the Family Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>Open Records Letter No. 2016-10113 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing the city withhold dates of birth of living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301 (a) of the Government Code).

(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 the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code by the city's police department. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code), 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. However, we note the requestor represents the child victim listed in the information, and is not alleged to have committed the abuse. 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 whether the submitted information is otherwise excepted from disclosure.

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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). However, in this instance, the requestor represents the persons whose privacy interest are at issue. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to information pertaining to these persons that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (“person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Further, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). We conclude the remaining information is not confidential under constitutional privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would

interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). This section is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Further, section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2–3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state a portion of the information contains information related to real-time locations of police units and their ability to receive and transmit communications. You assert release of this information would enable the public, particularly criminals, to disrupt police operations, to take advantage of police restrictions, and to anticipate and thwart police responses. You argue release of this type of information would endanger the lives and safety of police officers and, consequently, the public in general. Upon review, we find the release of a portion of this information, which we marked, would interfere with law enforcement. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1). However, we find you have failed to demonstrate release of the remaining information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released. Fam. Code § 261.201(k). Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ramsey A. Abarca", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ramsey A. Abarca  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RAA/dls

Ref: ID# 611678

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)