



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 12, 2016

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2016-15755

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 618570 (COSA File No. W118985).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for a specific police report and other police reports involving the requestor. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city has redacted portions of the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold

¹We note the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider its applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

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 or has statutory authorization to withhold the information without requesting a decision under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). We understand the city has redacted 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.² However, the city does not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the city is authorized to withhold the remaining redacted information at issue without first seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000) (previous determinations). Therefore, this type of information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether it falls within the scope of an exception to disclosure. However, because we can discern the nature of the redacted information, being deprived of the information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. Nonetheless, in the future, the city must not redact information from the information it submits to this office unless it is authorized to do so by statute or the information is the subject of a previous determination under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Failure to comply with section 552.301 may result in the information being presumed public under section 552.302 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

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. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 681-82. 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*

²Section 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. *Id.* § 552.147(b).

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.

We note the requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth under section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from her under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 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). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, none of the remaining information at issue 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. As the city raises no further exceptions against disclosure, the city must release the remaining information.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

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).

⁴We note the requestor has a right of access to some information being released pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a ruling from this office.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 618570

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)