



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2016

Mr. T. Evan Fisher
Counsel for Town of Double Oak
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Ross Tower
500 North Akard
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2016-14625

Dear Mr. Fisher:

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# 616505 (Ref No. 76550).

The Double Oak Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You inform us the department has released some information to the requestor. You state the department is withholding motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Section 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. *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).

²We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note, in addition to the information you redacted pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b), you have redacted information from Exhibit D. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .301(e)(1)(D). You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, you have been granted a previous determination to withhold this additional information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). In this instance, we are able to discern the nature of the information that has been redacted; thus, being deprived of that information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering the redacted information be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of "specific information requested"); *id.* § 552.302. Thus, in the future, the department should refrain from redacting, without authorization, any information it submits to this office in seeking an open records ruling.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You state portions of the submitted information, including one of the audio recordings, identify a complainant who reported a violation of a law to the department. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the department has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked and indicated. You state the department does not have the

technological capability to redact this information from the audio recording. However, because the department had the ability to copy the submitted audio recording for our review, we believe the department has the capability to produce copies of only the non-confidential portions of the audio recording. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information we marked in the submitted documents and the information we indicated in one of the submitted audio recordings under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remainder of the information you have marked consists of the identifying information of an individual who made the initial report of a criminal violation to the department for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.101 on that basis.

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 also concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, 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 *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. However, we note the remaining information includes the requestor's client's date of birth and private information. The requestor has a right of access to this information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (“ . . . person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to a person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's

³Section 552.102(a) exempts 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).

privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself).

Upon review, we find the information we marked in the submitted documents and indicated in the remaining audio recordings, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. As noted above, we believe the department has the capability to produce copies of only the non-confidential portions of the audio recordings. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked in the submitted documents and the information we indicated in the remaining audio recordings under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information you have marked or indicated is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 560.003 of the Government Code. Section 560.003 provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” Gov’t Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). There is no indication the requestor has a right of access to the submitted fingerprints under section 560.002. *See id.* § 560.002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual’s biometric identifier to another person unless the individual consents to disclosure). Accordingly, the department must withhold the fingerprints we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information contains additional unredacted motor vehicle record information. Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *Id.* § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is motor vehicle record information. Accordingly, you may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we marked in the submitted documents and the information we indicated in one of the submitted audio recordings under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The department must withhold (1) the information we marked in the submitted documents and the information we indicated in the remaining audio recordings under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) the

fingerprints we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code; and (3) the motor vehicle record information we 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gerald A. Arismendez". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of each name being capitalized and prominent.

Gerald A. Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/dls

Ref: ID# 616505

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)