



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.



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 20, 2015

Ms. Heather Silver
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla, 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.

OR2015-09796

Dear Ms. Silver:

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# 564252.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information related to a specified fire investigation. You state the city will redact information pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-18466 (2011).¹ You also state the city is withholding certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim some of 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 representative sample of information.³

¹Open Records Letter No. 2011-18466 is a previous determination issued to the city's police department authorizing it to withhold, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code, an originating address of a 9-1-1 caller furnished by a service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code 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 information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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.

You assert the submitted date of birth of a deceased member of the public, which you have marked, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on the basis of the decision in *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, No. D-1-GV-12-000861 (53rd Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex., July 11, 2013). 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. However, upon review, we find the court’s decision, which the Office of the Attorney General appealed and is pending with the Third Court of Appeals of Texas, Case No. 03-13-00546-CV, is limited to the facts and information at issue in the underlying letter rulings, and does not apply to the information currently at issue. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the date of birth in the information at issue based on the court’s decision in that case.

We understand you also to contend the date of birth at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 521.051 of the Business and Commerce Code. Section 521.051(a) of the Business and Commerce Code provides:

A person may not obtain, possess, transfer, or use personal identifying information of another person without the other person’s consent and with intent to obtain a good, a service, insurance, an extension of credit, or any other thing of value in the other person’s name.

Bus. & Comm. Code § 521.051(a). “Personal identifying information” means “information that alone or in conjunction with other information identifies an individual” and includes an individual’s date of birth. *Id.* § 521.002(a)(1)(A). You assert the marked date of birth meets the definition of “personal identifying information” under section 521.002(a)(1) of the Business and Commerce Code. *See id.* § 521.002(a)(1). We note section 521.051(a) of the Business and Commerce Code does not prohibit the transfer of personal identifying information of another person unless the transfer is made with the intent to obtain a good, a service, insurance, an extension of credit, or any other thing of value in the other person’s name without that person’s consent. *See id.* § 521.051(a). In this instance, the city’s release of the information at issue would be for the purpose of complying with the Act, and not “with intent to obtain a good, a service, insurance, an extension of credit, or any other thing of value[.]” *See id.* Therefore, section 521.051(a) of the Business and Commerce Code does not prohibit the city from transferring the requested information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the date of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 521.051 of the Business and Commerce Code.

Section 552.101 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. We note because “the right of privacy is purely personal,” that right “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. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652I)); 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 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). The dates of birth of living members of the public are not protected by common-law privacy under section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses, telephone numbers, and dates of birth not private). Furthermore, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld under common-law privacy to protect the interest of the deceased individual. Upon review, we find the date of birth of a deceased individual does not satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, this information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground. Thus, the city must release the 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, 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 564252

c: Requestor

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