



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 23, 2016

Mr. M. Matthew Ribitzki
Deputy City Attorney
City of Burleson
141 West Renfro
Burleson, Texas 76028

OR2016-14277

Dear Mr. Ribitzki:

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# 615557 (ORR No. 653/16-0229).

The City of Burleson (the "city") received a request for all records relating to a named individual. You state you will redact information pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code and Open Record Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You also state you will redact information pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2016-08169 (2016).² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code 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. Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

²Open Records Letter No. 2016-08169 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing the city to withhold dates of birth of living individuals under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.301; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses 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. This office has found 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. United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not a compilation of the individual’s criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

The present request seeks all reports pertaining to a named individual. This request requires the city to compile the named individual’s criminal history and implicates the named individual’s right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the city has submitted information that does not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not consist of a compilation of the named individual’s criminal history, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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 and indicated was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse. *See id.* §§ 261.001(1) (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code), 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. We have no indication the city 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 information we marked and indicated is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).* However, we find the city has not established any of the remaining information at issue consists of a report of child abuse or neglect nor does the information reveal the identity of an individual who made a report of suspected child abuse or neglect for purposes of section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. Furthermore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code. Therefore, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part, the following:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 at 3-4 (1988), 370 at 2 (1983), 343 at 1 (1982). We have further found when a file is created as a result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file referring to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” Open Records Decision No. 546 at 1 (1990). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is confidential under the MPA. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides that “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” *See id.* § 560.003; *see also id.* §§ 560.001(1) (defining “biometric identifier” to include fingerprints), .002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual’s biometric identifier to another person unless individual consents to disclosure). Upon review, we find the fingerprints we have marked constitutes a biometric identifier for purposes of section 560.003 of the Government Code. Thus, the city must withhold the marked fingerprints under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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).

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). Some of the remaining information relates to an alleged sexual assault. 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 the report we have marked in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Furthermore, we find portions of the remaining information satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You state you will redact certain motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.³ Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the submitted information contains additional information subject to section 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the additional motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the marked fingerprints under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the additional motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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/>

³Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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).

[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,



Kavid Singh
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KVS/som

Ref: ID# 615557

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)