



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 29, 2015

Ms. Lisa D. Mares  
Counsel for the City of McKinney  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2015-27205

Dear Ms. Mares:

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# 598740.

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified case. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 state that the submitted information relates to "an open and pending investigation." We note, however, that the submitted information pertains to an investigation of misdemeanor theft that occurred on August 28, 2012. We note the statute of limitations for misdemeanor theft is two years from the date of the offense. *See* Penal Code § 31.03(e)(2)(A) (theft of property valued \$100 or more but less than \$750 is a misdemeanor offense), Code of Criminal Procedure art. 12.02 (indictment for this category of theft may be presented within two years

from date of commission of offense, and not afterward). Thus, the statute of limitations for the offense in the submitted information has expired. You have not informed this office that any criminal charges were filed within the limitation period nor have you explained release of the submitted information would interfere with law enforcement. We therefore determine the city may not withhold the information at issue pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code.

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. This section encompasses 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, 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. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d 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> *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. We note common-law privacy protects personal privacy. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to her information under section 552.023 of the Government Code, and her date of birth may not be withheld from her under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at (4) (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). However, the city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the remaining information.

---

<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).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jesse Harvey", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jesse Harvey  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JH/eb

Ref: ID# 598740  
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)