



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 22, 2015

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman  
Counsel for the City of Frisco  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2015-27000

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 591769.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is 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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we find the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find the submitted information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. However, we note the requestor is the parent of the child victim named in the information at issue, and the parent is not alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information from the requestor under section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). We also note section 261.201(l)(2) states that any information excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law may still be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Accordingly, we will consider whether the submitted information is otherwise excepted from release under the Act.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in part:

(a) Information contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in any record compiled from the information contained in one or more certificates that identifies or tends to identify an owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of an owner of a vaccinated animal is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]. The information contained in the certificate or record may not include the social security number or the driver's license number of the owner of the vaccinated animal.

Health & Safety Code § 826.0211(a). Section 826.0211 applies only to information contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in a record compiled from information contained in one or more rabies vaccination certificates. We find you have failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information is confidential under section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 826.0311 of the Health and Safety Code, which states, in relevant part:

(a) Information that is contained in a municipal or county registry of dogs and cats under Section 826.031 that identifies or tends to identify the owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of the owner of the registered dog or cat is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]. The information contained in the registry may not include the social security number or the driver's license number of the owner of the registered animal.

(b) The information may be disclosed only to a governmental entity or a person, that under a contract with a governmental entity, provides animal control services or animal registration services for the governmental entity for purposes related to the protection of public health and safety. A governmental entity or person that receives the information must maintain the confidentiality of the information, may not disclose the information under [the Act], and may not use the information for a purpose that does not directly relate to the protection of public health and safety.

*Id.* § 826.0311(a), (b). Section 826.0311 only applies to the actual pet registry; it is not applicable to the contents of other records, even though those documents may contain the same information as the pet registry. *See* Open Records Decision No. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express, and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure). In this instance, you have not explained, and the

submitted documents do not reflect, the submitted information consists of the actual pet registry for the city. Thus, we find you have failed to establish any of the submitted information is contained in a municipal or county registry of dogs and cats and identifies or tends to identify the owner of a registered dog or cat. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0311 of the Health and Safety Code.

The city asserts the dates of birth are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 also 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.<sup>1</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. Thus, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

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.<sup>2</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold

---

<sup>1</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).

<sup>2</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).

the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>3</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.

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,



Kenny Moreland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KJM/som

Ref: ID# 591769

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to the information being released. *See* Fam. Code § 261.201(k). Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.