



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 12, 2016

Mr. Richard D. McCracken  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
The City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2016-00876

Dear Mr. McCracken:

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# 593718 (City PIR No. W046536).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all records involving the requestor's client and another named individual, including a specified report. You state the city has provided some information to the requestor. You state the city will redact the originating telephone number of a 9-1-1 caller pursuant to the previous determination issued to the city in Open Records Letter No. 2011-15641 (2011).<sup>1</sup> You claim 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 552.101 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 the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the

---

<sup>1</sup>Open Records Letter No. 2011-15641 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing it to withhold, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code, an originating telephone number of a 9-1-1 caller furnished to the city by a service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not private as criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

The present request, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the requestor's client and another named individual. However, we note the requestor has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to her client's information that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. *See Gov't Code* § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person or person's authorized to whom information relates on grounds that information is considered confidential under privacy principles); *Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4* (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, information relating to the requestor's client may not be withheld from her as a compilation of her client's criminal history under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Furthermore, we note the requestor seeks, in part, a specified police report. This information is not part of the other named individual's criminal history, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy as a criminal history compilation. Therefore, we will address your remaining argument against disclosure.

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 the information you have marked Exhibit C-1 relates to an open criminal investigation and release of the information would interfere with that investigation. *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). Based on these representations and our review, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code is applicable to Exhibit C-1.

However, 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 information, which you state has been released, the city may withhold Exhibit C-1 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of a particular insurance carrier). Whether the public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983). 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>2</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. As noted above, the requestor has a right of access to her client's private information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Upon review, we find, with the exception of the date of birth belonging to the requestor's client, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, along with the additional information we have marked, in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

---

<sup>2</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.<sup>3</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.130. Upon review, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, which you state has been released, the city may withhold Exhibit C-1 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, with the exception of the date of birth belonging to the requestor's client, along with the additional information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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.

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,



Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

---

<sup>3</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).

<sup>4</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a ruling from this office.

Ref: ID# 593718

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)