



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 27, 2016

Ms. Terri Bradley
Records Division
City of Rosenberg
2120 Fourth Street
Rosenberg, Texas 77471-5124

OR2016-12185

Dear Ms. Bradley:

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# 611875.

The Rosenberg Police Department (the "department") received a request for nineteen categories of information pertaining to a specified incident, including copies of other requests under the Act received by the department. You state the department has released some of the requested information. 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.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present request for information because it was created after the present request for information was received.¹ This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the department need not release such information, which we have marked, in response to this request.

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request, create responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by the governmental body or on its behalf. See *Economic 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), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

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 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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10 (1992), 545 (1990), 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). 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* ORD 373. However, we note this office has found names, telephone numbers, and addresses are not excepted from public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7 (1987).

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.² *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.

Upon review, we find some of the responsive information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.³ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining

²Section 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).

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

responsive information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department may not withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.108(a)(2) 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 . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You provide no arguments explaining the responsive information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) and may not withhold the remaining responsive information on that basis.

We note the remaining responsive information contains e-mail addresses of members of the public that are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body,” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked are not of the types specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). *See id.* § 552.137(c). Accordingly, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release. The department must release the remaining responsive 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.

⁴The 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).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lindsay E. Hale". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/sdk

Ref: ID# 611875

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)