



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 7, 2016

Ms. Marie N. Rovira  
Counsel for the Town of Addison  
Messer Rockefeller Fort  
6351 Preston Road, Suite 350  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2016-00555

Dear Ms. Rovira:

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# 593236.

The Town of Addison (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for a specified 9-1-1 call. 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 information made confidential by other statutes, such as chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code are applicable to emergency 9-1-1 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These sections make the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.118 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than two million.

The town is in Dallas County, which we understand has a population of over 3.3 million, and you indicate the town is part of an emergency communication district that is subject to

section 772.118 of the Health and Safety Code. You state the submitted audio recording contains an originating address, which is confidential, and the town lacks the technological capacity to redact the information. Upon review, however, we note the address contained in the submitted audio recording was provided directly by the 9-1-1 caller at issue. Thus, we find no portion of the submitted audio recording consists of the originating telephone number or address of a 9-1-1 caller that was furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. Accordingly, no portion of the submitted audio recording may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 772.118 of the Health and Safety Code.

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 or 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))); *see* 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 Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”).

Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing information of a living individual that is not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the town may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 on that basis. As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released.

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 that reads "Mili Gosar". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mili Gosar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MG/akg

Ref: ID# 593236

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)