



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 2, 2015

Mr. Jonathan T. Koury  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Bryan  
P.O. Box 1000  
Bryan, Texas 77805

OR2015-25166

Dear Mr. Koury:

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# 588983 (ORR No. 1101).

The City of Bryan (the "city") received a request for all reports associated with police department calls to a specified address during a specified time period. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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). Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *Id.* § 552.301(e). You state the city received the request for information on

August 26, 2015 and the requestor clarified the request on August 27, 2015. *See id.* § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). We note September 7, 2015, was Labor Day. This office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purposes of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. We understand the city provided the requestor with a cost estimate pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code on August 27, 2015, and received payment on September 11, 2015. However, we note section 552.2615 provides the submission of an estimate of charges to the requestor does not affect the governmental body's deadlines to ask for an attorney general decision under section 552.301. *See Gov't Code* § 552.2615(g) (providing "[t]he time deadlines imposed by this section do not affect the application of a time deadline imposed on a governmental body under Subchapter G"). Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was September 11, 2015, and the city's fifteen-business-day deadline was September 18, 2015. However, the city submitted the information required under sections 552.301(b) and (e) in an envelope bearing a post-office meter mark of September 22, 2015. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the 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, 381-82 (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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third-party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). You claim sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information. However, these exceptions are discretionary in nature. They serve to protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived; as a result, they do not constitute compelling reasons to withhold information. *See Simmons*, 166 S.W.3d at 350 (section 552.108 is not compelling reason to withhold information under section 552.302); *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of

the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code or section 552.108 of the Government Code based on the city's interests. However, the interests of a governmental body, other than the one that failed to comply with section 552.301, to withhold information under sections 552.103 and 552.108 can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 586 at 2-3 (1991), 469 (1987) (university may withhold information under statutory predecessor to section 552.103 of the Government Code to protect district attorney's interest in anticipated criminal litigation). You have provided representations from the Brazos County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") objecting to release of some of the submitted information under sections 552.103 and 552.108. Furthermore, you also claim sections 552.101 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information. In addition, we note portions of the submitted information are subject to sections 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Because these sections can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider the applicability of these sections to the submitted information. We will also consider the applicability of section 552.108 on behalf of the district attorney's office.

Section 552.108(a)(1) 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 . . . 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 requested information 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 (Tex. 1977). You have provided documentation from the district attorney's office demonstrating the information you have marked Exhibit D relates to pending criminal prosecutions and stating the district attorney's office objects to release of the information. Based upon this representation, we conclude release of the information at issue will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to Exhibit D.

However, we note, and you acknowledge, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

information, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.<sup>2</sup>

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Further, we note the remaining information contains dates of birth of members of the public. 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>3</sup> *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. Upon review, we find the dates of birth of public citizens and the additional information we have marked satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the dates of birth of public citizens within the remaining information, along with the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the district attorney's office's remaining argument to withhold this information, except to note basic information may not be withheld from public disclosure under section 552.103. See Open Records Decision No. 597 at 2-3 (1991).

<sup>3</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*. Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information, which we have marked, consist of motor vehicle record information. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. The city must withhold: (1) the dates of birth of public citizens within the remaining information, along with the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, (2) the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code, (3) the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code, and (4) the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>4</sup>

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.

---

<sup>4</sup>We note the remaining information, including the basic information, includes social security numbers. 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 Gov't Code § 552.147(b)*.

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 black ink, appearing to read 'Tim Neal', with a stylized, cursive script.

Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 588983

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)