



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 25, 2016

Mr. Christopher Gregg  
Counsel for the City of Nassau Bay  
Gregg & Gregg, P.C.  
16055 Space Center Boulevard, Suite 150  
Houston, Texas 77062

OR2016-12006

Dear Mr. Gregg:

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# 611910.

The City of Nassau Bay (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for records pertaining to a specified location from a specified time period. You state the city will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city has redacted dates of birth. 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 or a statute authorizes the governmental body to make such redactions. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 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 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."<sup>1</sup> Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 261.201(a) 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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find the information we have marked was used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of Family Code chapter 261); *see also 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 disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). Accordingly, we find this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. You have not indicated the city's police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information; therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.<sup>2</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (addressing predecessor statute).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code, which makes confidential juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct by a child that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. Fam. Code § 58.007(c). The relevant portion of section 58.007 provides:

(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;

(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.

*Id.* § 58.007(c). *See also id.* § 51.02(2) (defining “child” as a person who is ten years of age or older and younger than seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct). Upon review, we find the information we have marked involves delinquent conduct by a child that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” for purposes of section 58.007). Further, it does not appear any of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply. Therefore, the information we have marked is confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

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

---

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

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

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 remaining information in Exhibit A-2 relates to pending criminal cases. Based on your representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue 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 information in Exhibit A-2.

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 has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the remaining information in Exhibit A-1 relates to criminal cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this representation and our review, we find section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to reports 15-00136, 15-00296, and 15-00475. However, you have provided documentation revealing reports 15-00101, 15-00249, and 15-00378 relate to criminal cases that resulted in guilty pleas. Therefore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate reports 15-00101, 15-00249, and 15-00378 relate to criminal cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Accordingly, the city may not withhold reports 15-00101, 15-00249, and 15-00378 under section 552.108(a)(2).

We note 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*. *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 remaining information in Exhibit A-1 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and reports 15-00136, 15-00296, and 15-00475 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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>4</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. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked and all public citizens' dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. With the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit A-1 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and reports 15-00136, 15-00296, and 15-00475 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked and all public citizens' dates of birth in the remaining information 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/>

---

<sup>4</sup>Section 552.102(a) exempts 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).

[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 "Sean Nottingham". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Sean" and last name "Nottingham" clearly distinguishable.

Sean Nottingham  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SN/som

Ref: ID# 611910

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)