



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 4, 2015

Ms. Captoria Brown
Paralegal
Office of the City Attorney
City of Carrollton
1945 East Jackson Road
Carrollton, Texas 75006

OR2015-23132

Dear Ms. Brown:

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# 586195 (City ID No. 5639).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified complaint. 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." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section 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. Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of*

Texas, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.¹ *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. 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*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked, which includes the dates of birth of public citizens, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.² However, the city has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest; thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information that is made confidential by statute. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act ("HSA"), section 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. You assert portions of the remaining information are confidential under section 418.179(a) of the Government Code, which provides:

Information is confidential if the information:

- (1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and
- (2) relates to the details of the encryption codes or security keys for a public communications system.

Gov't Code § 418.179. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. See Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls

¹Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state the information at issue consists of "encrypted codes maintained specifically and particularly for the purpose of maintaining confidential radio communication so as to facilitate the prevention, detection, or investigation [of] an act of terrorism or related criminal activity." Further, you state the encrypted codes were created pursuant to a Homeland Security grant, and the release of the encrypted codes "would compromise the safety and strategies of the city's police and fire departments." Upon review, however, we find the remaining information does not consist of radio codes. Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information consists of encryption codes or security keys for a public communications system that is collected, assembled, or maintained by the city for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.179 of the Government Code. As the city does not raise another exception to disclosure, the city must release the remaining 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,



Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 586195

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)