



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

This ruling has been modified by court action.
The ruling and judgment can be viewed in PDF
format below.



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 26, 2014

Mr. Michael Bostic
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

The ruling you have requested has been amended as a result of litigation and has been attached to this document.

OR2014-10958

Dear Mr. Bostic:

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# 526848.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information relating to the estate of a named individual who participated in the home replacement/repair program in the Housing and Community Service Department. You state the city will release some of the requested information upon receipt of payment with redactions pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ We understand the city will redact personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 and social security numbers it has marked pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under

¹Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion.

sections 552.101, 552.115, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

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 section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders federal tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term "return information" as "a taxpayer's identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]" *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term "return information" expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer's liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff'd in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes tax return information that is confidential under section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information you have marked is subject to section 6103(a); thus, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 on that basis.

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

Although the city states it will redact social security numbers pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684, we note that decision does not encompass social security numbers. However, 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 the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

³We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy).

In Open Records Decision No. 373, this office determined financial information submitted by applicants for federally-funded housing rehabilitation loans and grants was "information deemed confidential" by a common-law right of privacy. The financial information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 373 included sources of income, salary, mortgage payments, assets, medical and utility bills, social security and veterans benefits, retirement and state assistance benefits, and credit history. Additionally, in Open Records Decision No. 523, we held the credit reports, financial statements, and financial information included in loan files of individual veterans participating in the Veterans Land Program were excepted from disclosure by the common-law right of privacy. Similarly, we have concluded financial information relating to an applicant for housing assistance satisfies the first requirement of common-law privacy, in that it constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing facts about the individual, such that its public disclosure would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities.

The second requirement of the common-law privacy test requires the information not be of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 668. While the public generally has some interest in knowing whether public funds expended for housing assistance are being given to qualified applicants, we believe ordinarily this interest will not be sufficient to justify the invasion of the applicant's privacy that would result from disclosure of information concerning his or her financial status. *See* ORD 373 (although any record maintained by governmental body is arguably of legitimate public interest, if only relation of individual to governmental body is as applicant for housing rehabilitation grant, second requirement of common-law privacy test not met). In particular cases, a requestor may demonstrate the existence of a public interest that will overcome the second requirement of the common-law privacy test. However, whether there is a public interest in this information sufficient to justify its disclosure must be decided on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORDs 523, 373.

Open Records Decision Nos. 373 and 523 draw a distinction between the confidential "background financial information furnished to a public body about an individual" and "the basic facts regarding a particular financial transaction between the individual and the public body." Open Records Decision Nos. 523, 385 (1983). Subsequent decisions of this office analyze questions about the confidentiality of background financial information consistently with Open Records Decision No. 373. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600, 523, 481 (1987) (individual financial information concerning applicant for public

employment is closed), 480 (1987) (names of students receiving loans and amounts received from Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation are public). We note, however, this office has concluded the names and present addresses of current or former residents of a public housing development are not protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 318 (1982). Likewise, the amounts paid by a housing authority on behalf of eligible tenants are not protected from disclosure under privacy interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 268 (1981); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10, 545, 489 (1987), 480. Whether the public has a legitimate interest in an individual's sources of income must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 373 at 4; *see also* ORDs 600, 545.

We note the common-law right to privacy is a personal right that "terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded." *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) ("the right of privacy lapses upon death"), H-917 (1976) ("We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death."); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You contend the dates of birth you have marked are protected under common-law privacy. We note, however, the dates of birth of members of the public are generally not highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* ORD 455 at 7 (home addresses, telephone numbers, and dates of birth not protected under privacy). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the remaining information you have marked may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

The city raises section 552.115 of the Government Code for the submitted birth certificate. Section 552.115 excepts from disclosure "[a] birth or death record maintained by the bureau of vital statistics of the Texas Department of Health or a local registration official[.]" Gov't Code § 552.115(a). Section 552.115 is applicable only to information maintained by the bureau of vital statistics or local registration officials. *See* Open Records Decision No. 338 (1982) (statutory predecessor to section 552.115 excepted only birth and death records that are maintained by the bureau of vital statistics and local registration officials). Because this information is not maintained by the city's local registration official, the city may not withhold the submitted birth certificate under section 552.115 of the Government Code.

We understand the city redacted motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130. Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or 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. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, and the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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/>

⁴Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including Texas driver's license numbers under section 552.130 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. However, the Texas legislature amended section 552.130 to allow a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) of the Government Code 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). Thus, the statutory amendment to section 552.130 of the Government Code supercedes Open Records Decision No. 684. Therefore, a governmental body may redact information subject to subsection 552.130(a) only in accordance with section 552.130, not Open Records Decision No. 684.

[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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 526848

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

OCT 21 2015

At 3:00 P M.
Velva L. Price, District Clerk

Cause No. D-1-GV-12-001471

CITY OF DALLAS,
Plaintiff,

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF

v.

GREG ABBOTT,
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS,
Defendant.


TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS

53rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT

FINAL JUDGMENT

On October 20, 2015, the above-styled and numbered cause came on for trial. Plaintiff, the City of Dallas, and Defendant, Ken Paxton, Attorney General of Texas, appeared by counsel of record and announced ready. This cause is an action under the Public Information Act (PIA), Tex. Gov't Code ch. 552, in which the City of Dallas (the "City"), sought to withhold certain information from public disclosure. The parties submitted all matters in controversy, legal and factual, to the Court. The Court renders judgment for the City of Dallas.


In accordance with *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied), it is ADJUDGED, ORDERED, and DECREED that the dates of birth of members of the public that are subject to the following attorney general rulings are excepted from disclosure under PIA section 552.101 as information coming within the common-law right of privacy: OR2012-15687, OR2013-13460, OR2013-14173, OR2013-15029, OR2014-02027, OR2014-03053, OR2014-10958, OR2014-12007, OR2014-13280, OR2015-00856, OR2015-03225, OR2015-04746, OR2015-06486, OR2015-09796, OR2015-09650, OR2015-12740, OR2015-12882, OR2015-11167, OR2015-12505, OR2015-14442, OR2015-12568, OR2015-15076, OR2015-14991, OR2015-15428, OR2015-15574, OR2015-16409, OR2015-16823, OR2015-17001, OR2015-16711, OR2015-17686, OR2015-17639, and OR2015-18652.



All relief not expressly granted is denied.

This judgment disposes of all claims between all parties and is a final judgment.

SIGNED on the 20th day of OCTOBER, 2015.


PRESIDING JUDGE

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


JAMES B. PINSON

State Bar No. 16017700
Assistant City Attorney
Dallas City Attorney's Office
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7BN
Dallas, Texas
Telephone: (214) 670-3519
Facsimile: (214) 670-0622
james.pinson@dallascityhall.com

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF,
THE CITY OF DALLAS


KIMBERLY FUCHS

State Bar No. 24044140
Chief, Open Records Litigation
Administrative Law Division
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
Telephone: (512) 475-4195
Facsimile: (512) 320-0167
kimberly.fuchs@texasattorneygeneral.gov

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT,
KEN PAXTON, ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF TEXAS