



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 7, 2016

Ms. Jessica Richard Crawford
Assistant City Attorney
City of New Braunfels
424 South Castell Avenue
New Braunfels, Texas 78130

OR2016-20167

Dear Ms. Crawford:

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# 628311 (ORR# 2115-16).

The City of New Braunfels (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified address for a specified period of time and information pertaining to two named individuals during a specified period of time. The city claims the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions 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 the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing fact, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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. 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. The requestor asks, in part, for all information held by the city concerning two named individuals. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement records depicting either of the named individuals 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.¹ However, the city has submitted documents that do not list either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Thus, this information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

[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). The city asserts Exhibit E was used or developed in an investigation by the city's police department (the "department") under chapter 261. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1) (defining "abuse" for purposes of section 261.201). Upon review, we find the information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city does not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such rule exists. Given that assumption, the city must withhold Exhibit E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other arguments of the city to withhold this information.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other argument of the city to withhold this information.

To conclude, to the extent the city maintains any unspecified law enforcement records depicting either of the named individuals 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 Exhibit E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/eb

Ref: ID# 628311

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)