



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 2, 2016

Ms. Paige Mebane
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, Third Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-09867

Dear Ms. Mebane:

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# 608209 (City PIR No. W049394).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to specified incidents. You state the city has released some of the requested information to the requestor. 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 "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't 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. 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.¹ *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. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy.

You seek to withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated this is a situation in which the entirety of the information at issue must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 on that basis. Upon review, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, we find the city must withhold the information you have marked and we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As the city does not raise another exception to disclosure, 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, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

¹Section 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).

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 "Lee Seidlits", written in a cursive style.

Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/bw

Ref: ID# 608209

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)