



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 8, 2016

Ms. Paige Mebane
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, Third Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2016-20245

Dear Ms. Mebane:

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# 631596 (City Request # W054128).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor. 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.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires that a governmental body ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You state the city received the request for information on August 5, 2016. Because you do not inform this office the city was closed for business any of the days at issue, we find the city's ten-business-day deadline was August 19, 2016. While you raised section 552.101 of the Government Code within the ten-business-day time period as required by section 552.301(b), the city did not raise section 552.108 of the Government Code until after the ten-business-day deadline had passed. Thus, the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 as to its assertion of section 552.108.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third-party interests. *See* ORD 630. The city claims section 552.108 of the Government Code for the submitted information. However, this exception is discretionary in nature. It serves to protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived; as such, it does not constitute a compelling reason to withhold information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Thus, in failing to comply with section 552.301 in regard to section 552.108, the city has waived its claims under section 552.108 and may not withhold any of the submitted information on this basis. However, we note sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code are applicable to some of the submitted information.¹ As sections 552.101 and 552.130 can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will consider the applicability of these sections to 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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. Section 58.007 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(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

¹The 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).

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.

...

(e) Law enforcement records and files concerning a child may be inspected or copied by a juvenile justice agency as that term is defined by Section 58.101, a criminal justice agency as that term is defined by Section 411.082, Government Code, the child, and the child's parent or guardian.

...

(j) Before a child or a child's parent or guardian may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (e), the custodian of the record or file shall redact:

(1) any personally identifiable information about a juvenile suspect, offender, victim, or witness who is not the child; [and]

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act] or other law.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c), (e), (j)(1)-(2). Upon review, we find the submitted information consists of law enforcement records of a juvenile engaged in delinquent conduct after September 1, 1997. *See id.* §§ 51.02(2) (for purposes of section 58.007(c), "child" means person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct), .03(a) (defining "delinquent conduct" for purposes of section 58.007). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to section 58.007 of the Family Code. However, we note the requestor, now an adult, is the juvenile offender in the information at issue. Thus, pursuant to section 58.007(e), the city may not withhold this information from the requestor under section 58.007(c). *See id.* § 58.007(e). Section 58.007(j)(1) provides that any personally identifiable information concerning other juvenile suspects, offenders, victims, or witnesses must be redacted. *See id.* § 58.007(j)(1). For purposes of section 58.007(j), we conclude a juvenile victim or witness is a person who is under eighteen years of age. Accordingly, we find none of the submitted information identifies other juvenile suspects, offenders, victims, or witnesses. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 58.007(j)(1). However, section 58.007(j)(2) states before a child or a child's parent may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under section 58.007(e), the custodian of the record shall

redact information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 58.007(j)(2). Thus, we will consider the applicability of other exceptions to the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, 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. 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). Additionally, 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.² *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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth you have marked, as well as additional dates of birth we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth you have marked, as well as additional dates of birth we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle

²Section 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).

record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to this requestor.³

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,



Jesse Harvey
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JH/bw

Ref: ID# 631596

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³We note the information being released includes social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b). The requestor has a special right of access to information being released pursuant to section 58.007(e) of the Family Code. *See* Fam. Code § 58.007(e). If the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).