



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 18, 2016

Ms. Susan Camp-Lee
Counsel for the City of Round Rock
Sheets & Crossfield, P.C.
309 East Main Street
Round Rock, Texas 78664-5246

OR2016-11465

Dear Ms. Camp-Lee:

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# 610845.

The City of Round Rock (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests for information pertaining to three specified incidents. You state the city will redact information pursuant to sections 552.136(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city only submitted information relating to one of the specified incidents. We assume, to the extent any information responsive to the remainder of the second request existed on the date the city received the request, the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See Gov't Code*

¹Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See Gov't Code* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(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 under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147(b).

§§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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 of the Government Code encompasses 411.192 of the Government Code, which governs the release of information maintained by the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) concerning the licensure of individuals to carry a concealed handgun. Section 411.192 provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [DPS] shall disclose to a criminal justice agency information contained in its files and records regarding whether a named individual or any individual named in a specified list is licensed under this subchapter. Information on an individual subject to disclosure under this section includes the individual’s name, date of birth, gender, race, zip code, telephone number, e-mail address, and Internet website address. Except as otherwise provided by this section and by Section 411.193, all other records maintained under this subchapter are confidential and are not subject to mandatory disclosure under the [Act].

(b) An applicant or license holder may be furnished a copy of disclosable records regarding the applicant or license holder on request and the payment of a reasonable fee.

Id. § 411.192(a), (b). The information you have marked in the submitted information consists of concealed handgun license information the city appears to have received from DPS. The requestor is neither a criminal justice agency nor the license holder whose information is at issue. Further, we note section 411.193 is not applicable in this instance. *See id.* § 411.193 (making statistical report including number of licenses issued, denied, revoked, or suspended during the preceding month available to the public). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.192 of the Government 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 and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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.). 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. 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. *Tex. Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Tex. 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. This office has also 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 Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Furthermore, 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). We also find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, we note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov't Code* § 411.082(2)(B).

Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, as well as the information you have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We understand the city redacted motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.² However, we note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130. Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal

²We 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).

identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.192 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth and the information you 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 remaining 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, 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,



Katelyn Blackburn-Rader
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB-R/bw

Ref: ID# 610845

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)