



**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

June 25, 2015

Ms. P. Armstrong  
Assistant City Attorney  
Criminal Law and Police Section  
City of Dallas  
1400 South Lamar Street  
Dallas, Texas 75215

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

OR2015-12568

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

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# 574703 (ORR No. 2015-09055).

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for a specified report involving a named individual. We understand the department will redact information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> 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 representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>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).

<sup>2</sup>We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.108(a) 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: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). The department states the information it has marked relates to a pending criminal investigation and prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of the submitted information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, the department may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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. We note dates of birth of members of the public are generally not highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses, telephone numbers, dates of birth not protected under privacy). Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Although you reference *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-00546-CV (Tex. App. — Austin May 22, 2015) (mem. op.), we note the time for filing a petition for review with the Texas Supreme Court has not expired. Tex. R. App. P. 53.7. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, the department may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this 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 cursive script that reads "Britni Fabian".

Britni Fabian  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BF/bhf

Ref: ID# 574703

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,*

v.

GREG ABBOTT,  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS,  
*Defendant.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF  
  
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 20<sup>th</sup> 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