



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 15, 2016

Mr. Peter G. Smith
City Attorney
City of Richardson
P.O. Box 831078
Richardson, Texas 75083-1078

OR2016-15992

Dear Mr. Smith:

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# 619039 (File No. 16-392).

The Richardson Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specific report number. We understand the department will redact motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the department claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the department has redacted portions of the submitted information. 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 or has statutory authorization to withhold the information without requesting a decision under the Act. *See*

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).

Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). The department does not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the department is authorized to withhold the 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 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 department 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. This section 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. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. The department argues the submitted information must be withheld in its entirety on the basis of common-law privacy. However, the department has not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the submitted information must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Thus, the department may not withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

As noted, 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 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, the information we have marked and indicated satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As the department raises no further exceptions against disclosure, the department 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,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 619039

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

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).