



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 2, 2016

Ms. Rachel Saucier
Legal Assistant
City of Georgetown
P.O. Box 409
Georgetown, Texas 78627-0409

OR2016-19888

Dear Ms. Saucier:

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# 625136 (PIR: G002545-061516).

The Georgetown Police Department (the "department") received a request for all information pertaining to a specified incident involving a named individual, including dash camera video recordings. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

- (a) Except as provided by Section 261.203, the following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(h) This section does not apply to an investigation of child abuse or neglect in a home or facility regulated under Chapter 42, Human Resources Code.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (h). The department states the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged child abuse. However, section 261.201 does not apply to an investigation of child abuse or neglect in a home or facility regulated under chapter 42 of the Human Resources Code. *Id.* § 261.201(h). The submitted information is related to an investigation of alleged abuse or neglect occurring in a child care facility that is regulated by the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services under chapter 42 of the Human Resources Code. Therefore, we find section 261.201 is not applicable to the investigation at issue, and the department may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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. *Id.* 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.¹ *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.

¹Section 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).

However, we note the requestor has a right of access to her clients' birth dates. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, the department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth in the submitted information, other than the dates of birth of the requestor's clients, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information.²

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# 625136

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, if the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a ruling from this office.