



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2016

Mr. Oscar Gabaldón Jr.
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2016-14644

Dear Mr. Gabaldón, Jr.:

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# 616315 (El Paso Reference No. W040740-041116 & 16-1026-7495).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified accident and four specified case numbers. You state the city has released information responsive to the request for information pertaining to the specified accident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you only submitted information relating to two of the specified cases. We assume, to the extent any information pertaining to the two remaining specified cases requested existed on the date the city received the request, the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental

¹We note the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in regard to the first request in requesting this decision. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, because the exception the city claims can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider the city's claimed exception for the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352. Although you also raise section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy for some of the submitted information, you provide no arguments explaining how this doctrine is applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert this doctrine. *See id.* §§ 552.301, 302.

body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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. A compilation of an individual’s criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual’s criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find that a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, this request does not seek a compilation of an individual’s criminal history: rather, the request is for information pertaining to a specified case numbers. Such a request does not implicate an individual’s common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information as criminal history compilation under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the remaining information contains dates of birth. 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.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. Thus, the city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.³ Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.⁴

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,



Katelyn Blackburn-Rader
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB-R/bw

Ref: ID# 616315

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁴We note the information being released contains social security numbers. 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 Gov't Code § 552.147(b).