



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 23, 2015

Mr. Richard A. McCracken  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2015-24572

Dear Mr. McCracken:

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# 588066 (PIR No. W043226).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all information related to a specified incident. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You state the city will withhold access device numbers under section 552.136(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You also state the city will redact the originating telephone number of a 9-1-1 caller under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code pursuant to the previous determination issued to the city in Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-15641 (2011).<sup>2</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). 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 under the Act. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

<sup>2</sup>Open Records Letter No. 2011-15641 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing the city to withhold the originating telephone numbers of 9-1-1 callers furnished to the city by a service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code, without requesting a decision from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). The submitted information includes a court-filed document that is subject to section 552.022(a)(17). The city must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17), unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold a portion of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public records. *See Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the court-filed document, which we have marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, because section 552.130 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of section 552.130 to the information at issue.<sup>4</sup> We will also address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17).

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 of the Government Code encompasses section 411.153 of the Government Code, which provides, as follows:

---

<sup>3</sup>You acknowledge, and we agree, the city did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, section 552.101 of the Government Code is a mandatory exception that can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302. Accordingly, we will consider the city's claims under that section.

<sup>4</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

- (a) A DNA record stored in the DNA database is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].
- (b) A person commits an offense if the person knowingly discloses to an unauthorized recipient information in a DNA record or information related to a DNA analysis of a sample collected under this subchapter.
- (c) An offense under this section is a state jail felony.
- (d) A violation under this section constitutes official misconduct.

*Id.* § 411.153. A “DNA record” means the results of a forensic DNA analysis performed by a DNA laboratory. *See id.* § 411.141(6)-(7). “Forensic analysis” is defined as “a medical, chemical, toxicologic, ballistic, or other expert examination or test performed on physical evidence, including DNA evidence, for the purpose of determining the connection of the evidence to a criminal action.” *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 38.35(4); *see also* Gov’t Code § 411.141(10) (providing that “forensic analysis” has meaning assigned by article 38.35). A “DNA database” means “one or more databases that contain forensic DNA records maintained by the director of [the Department of Public Safety (the “DPS”)].” Gov’t Code § 411.141(5); *see id.* § 411.001(3).

The director of DPS is required to establish certain procedures for DNA laboratories. *See id.* §§ 411.142(h) (requiring director establish standards for DNA analysis), .144(a). Section 411.144 of the Government Code provides that a DNA laboratory conducting a forensic DNA analysis under subchapter G of chapter 411 shall comply with subchapter G and the rules adopted under subchapter G. *See id.* § 411.144(d); 37 T.A.C. §§ 28.81, .82 (describing minimum standards by which forensic DNA laboratory must abide); *see also* Gov’t Code § 411.147(b). The director of DPS may release a DNA record in certain instances, including to a criminal justice agency for criminal justice or law enforcement purposes and to a criminal defendant for criminal defense purposes under certain circumstances. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.147(c).

You state the remaining information contains records relating to DNA analyses of samples collected during a criminal investigation. You further state the information at issue is the result of forensic DNA analyses performed by a DNA laboratory in accordance with DPS regulations. Based upon these representations and our review, we find the information you have marked consists of confidential DNA records under section 411.153 of the Government Code, and the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses laws that make criminal history record information (“CHRI”) confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision

No. 565 at 7 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* at 10-12. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F or Subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for criminal justice purposes. *See id.* § 411.089(b)(1). We note a Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) number constitutes CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, including the federal Driver’s Privacy Protection Act of 1994 (the “DPPA”), section 2721 of title 18 of the United States Code. Section 2721 provides, in part:

(a) In general.—A State department of motor vehicles, and any officer, employee, or contractor thereof, shall not knowingly disclose or otherwise make available to any person or entity:

(1) personal information, as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(3), about any individual obtained by the department in connection with a motor vehicle record, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section[.]

...

(b) Permissible uses.—Personal information referred to in subsection (a) . . . may be disclosed as follows:

(1) For use by any government agency . . . in carrying out its functions[.]

...

(c) Resale or redisclosure.—An authorized recipient of personal information (except a recipient under subsection (b)(11) or (12)) may resell or redisclose the information only for a use permitted under subsection (b) (but not for uses under subsection (b)(11) or (12)). . . . Any authorized recipient (except a recipient under subsection (b)(11)) that resells or rediscloses personal information covered by this chapter must keep for a period of 5 years records identifying each person or entity that receives information and the permitted purpose for which the information will be used and must make such records available to the motor vehicle department upon request.

18 U.S.C. § 2721(a)(1), (b)(1), (c). The DPPA defines “motor vehicle record,” in relevant part, as “any record that pertains to a motor vehicle operator’s permit . . . issued by a department of motor vehicles[.]” *Id.* § 2725(1). Section 2725 also defines personal information as “information that identifies an individual, including an individual’s photograph, social security number, driver identification number, name, address (but not the 5-digit zip code), telephone number, and medical or disability information, but does not include information on vehicular accidents, driving violations, and driver’s status.” *See id.* § 2725(3).

You assert some of the remaining information contains personal information obtained from the DPS that is protected under the DPPA. We note this office has concluded that the DPPA applies to information in the possession of DPS. Attorney General Opinion JC-0499 at 1 (2002). You explain the city obtained the personal information for use in carrying out its functions with regard to law enforcement.

Based upon your representations and our review, we find the city, in obtaining personal information from DPS to assist the city in carrying out its law enforcement functions, is an authorized recipient of personal information for purposes of section 2721(c). *See* 18 U.S.C. § 2721(b)(1) (providing that personal information may be disclosed by a state department of motor vehicles to any entity acting on behalf of a Federal, State, or local agency in carrying out its functions). Therefore, we conclude the information you have marked is personal information obtained from DPS by an authorized recipient and is confidential under section 2721 of title 18 of the United States Code. Accordingly, as we have no indication that release of this information would be for a use permitted under section 2721(b), we conclude the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 2721(a) of title 18 of the United States Code. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 2721(a)(1).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). The doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual’s

criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov't Code* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Further, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). Additionally, we note, the public has a legitimate interest in knowing the details of a crime. *See Lowe v. Hearst Commc'ns Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting a "legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity" (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994))).

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.<sup>5</sup> *Tex. 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.

Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the dates of birth of public citizens, including the date of birth we have indicated, in the remaining information. Additionally, we find some of the remaining information also satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must generally withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

---

<sup>5</sup>Section 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).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a). The city must generally withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We note the requestor may be the attorney of the suspect in the specified incident. To the extent the requestor is acting as the authorized representative of the suspect in the specified incident, the requestor has a right of access under section 552.023 to information pertaining to that individual that would otherwise be protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Accordingly, to the extent the requestor has a right of access to the information of the suspect we marked and indicated, such information may not be withheld from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy or section 552.130 of the Government Code. Alternatively, to the extent the requestor is not acting as the authorized representative of the suspect in the specified incident, the city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 2721(a) of title 18 of the United States Code. The city must generally withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and under section 552.130 of the Government Code; however, to the extent the requestor is acting as the authorized representative of the suspect in the specified incident, the city may not withhold the suspect's information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and 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](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,



Joseph Behnke  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 588066

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)