



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 22, 2016

Mr. Nicholas Toulet
Assistant City Attorney
City Attorney's Office
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79702

OR2016-14198

Dear Mr. Toulet:

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# 615349 (ID# 19176).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for all arrest reports and affidavits related to specified stalking incidents.¹ You state you have released some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.1175 of the Government Code.² 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

¹We note the city sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify the request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²Although you raise section 552.117, we note section 552.1175 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise for information not held by the city in an employment context.

Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code, which makes confidential juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. *See* Fam. Code § 58.007(c). Section 58.007 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(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). Upon review, we find the information in Exhibit B involves alleged juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See id.* §§ 51.02(2) (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 when the conduct occurred), .03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision”). The exceptions in section 58.007 do not appear to apply. Therefore, the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code.

Section 552.108(a) 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 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). The city states the information in Exhibit F relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of Exhibit F 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, the city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.108(a)(1) 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). Further, a compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. Cf. *U. S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We also note, 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.

Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not

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).

withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.1175 protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. Gov't Code § 552.1175(b). Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to "peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]" *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Therefore, if the peace officer at issue elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit E under section 552.1175. If the peace officer at issue does not elect to restrict access to his information, the city may not withhold the information we marked in Exhibit E.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.⁴ *See id.* § 552.130(a). Portions of the submitted information contain motor vehicle record information. The city must withhold all motor vehicle record information within the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. The city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the peace officer at issue elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit E under section 552.1175. The city must withhold all motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.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.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470(1987).

⁵We note the remaining information contains social security numbers. Section 552.147 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact the social security number of a living person without requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kavid Singh". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized font.

Kavid Singh
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KVS/som

Ref: ID# 615349

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)