



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 8, 2015

Mr. Nick Lealos
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2015-25665

Dear Mr. Lealos:

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# 590071 (DPS PIR No. 15-4307 & 15-5304).

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received two requests from different requestors for information relating to a specified incident. The department states it will redact information under section 552.1175(f) of the Government Code.¹ The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. The department also informs us it has notified the 97th Judicial District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") of its right to submit comments to this office as to why its information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments regarding availability of requested information). We have received comments from the district attorney's office. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹Section 552.1175(f) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact under section 552.1175(b), without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office, the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, dates of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals who properly elect to keep this information confidential. *See Gov't Code* § 552.1175(b), (f). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.1175(h). *See id.* § 552.1175(g), (h).

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *Id.* § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). The department states the submitted information relates to a concluded case that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on the department's representation, we conclude section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue.

Section 552.108, however, does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information made public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.²

We understand the department to claim 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, 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). However, because “the right of privacy is purely personal,” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded.” *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, *writ ref'd n.r.e.*); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652I (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open

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

Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any of the basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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# 590071

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)