



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 21, 2016

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

OR2016-14017

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# 615049.

The City of Southlake (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for twelve categories of information pertaining to a specified motor vehicle accident. You state you will redact information under sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code.² 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 subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. 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). Open 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.

²We note although you raise sections 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111, you provide no arguments explaining how these exceptions are applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that these exceptions apply to the submitted information. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301, .302.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code provides, in part:

(a) A communication between certified emergency medical services personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091 (a)-(b), (g). Except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), emergency medical service (“EMS”) records are deemed confidential under section 773.091. *See id.* § 773.091. Upon review, we find the information you have indicated consists of EMS records subject to chapter 773. Thus, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), which is not confidential under section 773.091, the city must withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety 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. This office has 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) (employee’s designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax

compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 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). 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.³ *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.

However, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); see also *Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652I (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Upon review, we find the city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth 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 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to his client's motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld under

³Section 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).

section 552.130. *See id.* § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Additionally, we note the right to privacy expires at death. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; ORD 272 at 1. Upon review, the submitted video recording contains motor vehicle record information subject to section 552.130 that does not relate to the requestor's client. The department states it does not have the technological capability to redact this motor vehicle record information from the recording. Accordingly, we conclude the department must withhold the submitted video recording in its entirety under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Further, we note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130. Therefore, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), the information you have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the submitted video recordings, the information we have marked, and the photographs you have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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

Ref: ID# 615049

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)