



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 6, 2016

Mr. M. Matthew Ribitzki  
Deputy City Attorney  
City of Burleson  
141 West Renfro  
Burleson, Texas 76028

OR2016-07719

Dear Mr. Ribitzki:

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# 604687.

The City of Burleson (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named individual, including a specific incident. You state you will redact information under sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim some of 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

---

<sup>1</sup>We note section 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). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 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 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) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Upon review, we find the present request, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual. Accordingly, we find the request implicates the named individual's right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note, however, the city has submitted documents relating to the incident specified by the requestor. This information does not implicate the privacy interests of the named individual. This information is not part of a compilation of the named individual's criminal history, and the city 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 the city's argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses laws that make criminal history record information ("CHRI") confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* at 10-12. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F or subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for criminal justice purposes. *See id.* § 411.089(b)(1). We note a Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") number constitutes CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find

the city must withhold the FBI number we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects the specific types of information the Texas Supreme Court held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. 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. Thus, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the FBI number we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.

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

---

<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).

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 "Katelyn Blackburn-Rader". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Katelyn Blackburn-Rader  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KB-R/bw

Ref: ID# 604687

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)