KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 16, 2015

Ms. Lisa D. Mares
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2015-11845

Dear Ms. Mares:

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# 568068 (McKinney ORR # 15-15118).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the submitted information pertains to a criminal investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the submitted information.

As you acknowledge, however, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure "basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime." *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic

information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing the types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic front page offense and arrest information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2).[1]

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 (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. However, we note the right to privacy is a personal right that "terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded"; therefore, it may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *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* 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).

You seek to withhold the basic information in its entirety under common-law privacy. As you acknowledge, the information that pertains to a deceased individual may not be withheld on the basis of this individual's privacy interests. Further, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue that pertains to living individuals is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You also assert the release of the basic information may infringe upon the privacy rights of the family members of the deceased individual. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions relating to the "zones of privacy" pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education the United States Supreme Court has recognized. *See Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy

---

[1]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs" and the scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy. *Id.* at 5 (internal quotations omitted) (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

As previously noted, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses upon death and may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also* ORD 272 at 1. The United States Supreme Court, however, has determined that surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information relating to their deceased relatives. *See Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157 (2004) (holding surviving family members have a right to personal privacy with respect to their close relative's death-scene images and such privacy interests outweigh public interest in disclosure). Upon review, we find none of the basic information implicates the privacy interests of a living individual for the purposes of constitutional privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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,



Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/bhf

Ref: ID# 568068

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)