



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 20, 2014

Ms. Stacie S. White  
Counsel for the Town of Flower Mound  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2014-18885

Dear Ms. White:

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# 540107.

The Town of Flower Mound (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to two specified incidents involving the requestor's husband. You state you will withhold some information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim portions of the submitted information are 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."

---

<sup>1</sup>We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 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). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold specific 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 decision.

Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information 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 elements of this test must be established. *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 information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.


In this instance, it appears the requestor is the spouse of the individual whose privacy interest is at issue. Thus, the requestor may be the authorized representative of her spouse, and may have a right of access to information pertaining to her spouse that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. Section 552.023(a) states "a person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests." Gov't Code § 552.023; *see* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, if the requestor is acting as the authorized representative of her spouse, then the town may not withhold the information we have marked from this requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the requestor is not acting as the authorized representative of her spouse, then the town must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no further exceptions against disclosure, the town must release the remaining submitted information.

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](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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Abigail T. Adams". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Abigail T. Adams  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ATA/ac

Ref: ID# 540107

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)