



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 20, 2009

Mr. J. David Dodd, III  
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.  
Attorney for City of DeSoto  
1800 Lincoln Plaza  
500 North Akard  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2009-10032

Dear Mr. Dodd:

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# 349509 (DeSoto ID# 36794).

The DeSoto Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the requested 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.

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 the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and of no legitimate public interest. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Common-law privacy protects the types of information that are held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See id.* at 683 (information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs). This office has determined that other types of information also are private under section 552.101. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing information attorney

general has held to be private). You contend that the submitted information is protected by common-law privacy. We note, however, that the information at issue is generally concerned with a deceased individual. Because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, a deceased individual has no common-law right to privacy. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters. Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145 (N.D. Tex. 1979); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984); H-917 (1976); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981). Moreover, the information at issue is related to a criminal investigation. Such information is generally a matter of legitimate public interest. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685 (whether matter is of legitimate interest to public can be considered only in context of each particular case); *cf.* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (family violence is a crime, not a private matter), 409 at 2 (1984) (identity of burglary victim not protected by common-law privacy). We therefore conclude that the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Section 552.1175 provides in part:

(a) This section applies only to:

(1) peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]

...

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, or social security number of an individual to whom this section applies, or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

(1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and

(2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

---

<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).