



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 24, 2016

Ms. Jennifer Burnett
Office of the General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2016-04401

Dear Ms. Burnett:

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# 599374 (OGC# 166604).

The University of Texas at Dallas (the "university") received a request for enrollment records and police reports involving a named individual, including a specified police report. You state the university does not maintain information responsive to portions of the request.¹ You indicate the university will release some information to the requestor. You state you will redact motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.² 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 public 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

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

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. This office has found 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. United States 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.

The present request, in part, seeks all police reports pertaining to a named individual. This aspect of the request requires the university to compile the named individual's criminal history and implicates the privacy of the named individual. Therefore, to the extent the university maintains unspecified law enforcement records, other than information pertaining to the specified incident, listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the university must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note, however, the university has submitted documents relating to the incident specified by the requestor. This information is not part of a compilation of the named individual's criminal history, and the university may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis. Accordingly, we will address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this 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 the information you have marked in the specified report pertains to an active criminal investigation being conducted by the university's police department. Based on your representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *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). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information you

have marked. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information you have marked in the specified report under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

Some of the remaining information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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.⁴ *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. Thus, the university must withhold the public citizen's date of birth in the remaining information, which you have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the university maintains unspecified law enforcement records, other than information pertaining to the specified incident, listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the university must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The university may withhold the information you have marked in the specified report under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The university must withhold the public citizen's date of birth in the remaining information, which you have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The university must release the remaining information.

Finally, you ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the university to withhold public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. See Gov't Code § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). After due consideration, we have decided to grant your request on this matter. Therefore, this letter ruling authorizes the university to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note common-law privacy is a personal right

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁴Section 552.102(a) exempts 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).

that lapses at an individual's death. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993), 272 (1981), 192 (1978). Therefore, this previous determination authorizes the university to withhold dates of birth of living individuals. This previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth belonging to deceased individuals. We also note a person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to information that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect the person's privacy interests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth requested by a person or the authorized representative of a person whose date of birth is at issue. Furthermore, information filed with a court is not protected by common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17); *Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (common-law privacy not applicable to court-filed document). Accordingly, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth contained in court-filed documents. So long as the elements of law, fact, and circumstances do not change so as to no longer support the findings set forth above, the university need not ask for a decision from this office again with respect to this type of information. *See* ORD 673 at 7-8 (listing elements of second type of previous determination under Gov't Code § 552.301(a)).

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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 599374

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)