



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 13, 2015

Ms. Paige Mebane
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
The City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2015-23873

Dear Ms. Mebane:

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# 586982 (Fort Worth PIR No. W044633).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information relating to a specified dangerous dog complaint. The city states it has released some of the requested information. We understand the city is redacting information pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code and under section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

²Although the city also raises Texas Rule of Evidence 508, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the informer's privilege for information not section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6 (2002).

Initially, we must address the city's procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), within ten business days after receiving a written request the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The city states it received the request for information on August 2, 2015. We note August 2, 2015, was a Sunday; therefore, for purposes of the Act, we find the city is deemed to have received the request on August 3, 2015. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline under section 552.301(b) was August 17, 2015. The city states it sought clarification of the request on August 20, 2015, and received clarification from the requestor on August 24, 2015. Thus, we understand the city to claim the deadlines should be reset because the city asked for clarification from the requestor. However, we note the city did not request clarification of the request until after the ten-business-day deadline for the request had passed. As such, the statutory deadlines for requesting an opinion from this office and submitting the required documentation for the request were not reset by the request for clarification and must be measured from the date the city received the request for information. *See generally City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (after requesting clarification within ten-business-day deadline, city timely submitted request for opinion within ten business days after receiving clarification). Thus, as stated above, the city's ten-business-day deadline was August 17, 2015. However, the request for a ruling was sent on September 8, 2015. *See* Gov't Code § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Therefore, we find the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). This statutory presumption can generally be overcome when information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). The city seeks to withhold some of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The purpose of the common-law informer's privilege is to protect the flow of information to a governmental body, rather than to protect a third person. Thus, the informer's privilege, unlike other claims under section 552.101, may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 6 (1990). Therefore, the city's assertion of the informer's privilege does not provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302, and the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. However, the city also raises section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.130.

Section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.130 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness. Therefore, we will address the applicability of section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.130 to the submitted information.

The city asserts the dates of birth it has marked are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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.³ *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. Thus, the city must withhold the dates of birth it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We understand the city is redacting motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130. Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov’t Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information it has marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the dates of birth it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the motor vehicle

³Section 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).

⁴We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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).

record information it has marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 586982

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)