



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 14, 2016

Ms. Andrea D. Russell
Counsel for the City of Crowley
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2016-13495

Dear Ms. Russell:

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# 614216.

The City of Crowley (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for two specified documents pertaining to a named individual. You state you will redact information under sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You also state you will redact information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We 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).

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Initially, we note that you have submitted only one incident report in response to the request. To the extent any additional responsive information existed on the date the city received this request, we assume you have released it. If you have not released any such records, you must do so. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. Gov't Code § 552.1175. We note section 552.1175 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, provided a governmental body does not pay for the cellular phone service. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-7 (1988). Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]” *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). The submitted information contains personal information of an individual at issue who elected to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you have marked and the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. However, the city may only withhold the personal cellular telephone number you have marked under section 552.1175 if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service.³

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. 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

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

the negligible public interest in disclosure.⁴ *Tex. 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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the public citizen's date of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you have marked and we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the personal cellular telephone number you have marked under section 552.1175 if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the public citizen's date 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, 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,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/dls

⁴Section 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).

Ref: ID# 614216

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)