KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 13, 2016

Mr. Stephen D. Gates
Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2016-13349

Dear Mr. Gates:

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# 614619 (City ID# 19185).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for all information related to a specified investigation. You state the city has released some information. 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 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 and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefit programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy.) Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining

information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest and, thus, none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses constitutional privacy, which protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5, 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7. The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions relating to the "zones of privacy" pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); *see also* ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); *see also* ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). We note some of the submitted photographs implicate an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. We conclude the city must withhold the photographs we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and constitutional 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, 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,

Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/dls

Ref: ID# 614619

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)